A

SVRVEY OF THE NEW RELIGION, DETECTING MANY GROSSE ABSVRDITIES WHICH IT IMPLIETH.

Set forth by Matthevv Kelliſon,

Doctor and Profeſſor of Diuinitie.

DIVIDED INTO EIGHT BOOKES.

Nevvly augmented by the Author.

Nunquid colligunt de ſpinis vuas, aut de tribulis ficus? Math. 7.
Do men gather grapes of thornes, or figges of thiſtles?

Vltra non proficient, inſipientia enim eorum manifeſta erit omnibus. 2. Tim. 3.
They ſhal proſper no further: for their ſollie ſhal be maniſeſt to al.



Printed at Doway by LAVRENCE KELLAM,
at the ſigne of the holie Lambe.

M. D C. V.

Approbatio.

VIsis *trium S. Theologiæ Doctorum Anglorum testimonijs, quibus testantur hunc librum cui titulus:* A Suruey of the new Religion, *à R^do D. Matthæo Kellisono S. Theologiæ Doctore & professore conscriptũ, nihil continere, quod fidei aut bonis moribus aduersetur; sed plurima, quæ ad fidem Catholicam stabiliendam, & Sectariorum errores profligandos faciunt; dignum censui, quem & ego calculo meo approbarem.*

Actum Duaci 23. Aprilis. *1605.*

Georgius Coluenerius S. Theologiæ Licentiatus ac Professor: & librorum in Academia Duacena visitator.



44
23
69

IN this edition, are added an Epistle of the author to the Honorable Lordes of the priuie Counsel: one chapter in the first booke: one chapter in the last booke: a table of the contents of al the bookes and chapters: the other table is renewed and augmented: and diuers other things in sundrie places for the clerer explication, and more ample proofe or disproofe of pointes handled before.

TO THE MOST HIGHE,
AND MIGHTIE PRINCE,
IAMES BY THE GRACE OF GOD,
KING OF GREAT BRITANIE, FRANCE,
and Ireland, Defender of
the Faith.

YOVR Majeſtie wil meruaile peraduẽture (moſt dread Soueraigne) how a prieſt, whoſe very name hath now ſo longe time, beene ſo odious in your Realme of great Britanie dareth be ſo bold, as to appeare in the preſence of ſo mightie a Prince, ſitting in a throne of Majeſtie and terrour, crowned with a Diademe of greater glorie then hitherto hath ſtoode vpon the king of England his head, and holding in his victorious hand a new Scepter, by which he commandeth al the Britaigne Ilandes, and like a Neptune, is Lord of the Ocean ſea, which honour was reſerued for your Royal Majeſtie, King IAMES of great Britanie France and Ireland.

2. And it may ſeeme ſtrange vnto your Highnes, to ſee one of my coate and condition amidſt the congratulations of al the Princes of Europe, ſaluting your Majeſtie with ſo long a Proeme: & euen then when their honourable Legates, haue ſo great and ſo important affaires, to communicate to your Majeſtie from their Lordes and Maiſters, to intrude into your chamber of Preſence, ſo rude a Meſſenger, and euil-

ſpoken Legate of myne, who ſpeaketh only by ſignes of written wordes, and demandeth audience in his maiſters name, who is fayne to ſend becauſe he dares not come: not that he doubteth of your Graces clemencie, or his owne innocencie, but becauſe ſuch as he is, hauing bene for ſo long a time, forbidden al acceſſe both to their prince and countrie, he dareth not approch ſo nere vnto your gracious preſence, though he be aſſured, that you are as milde a Prince, as mightie: and now as mightie, as anie Prince of Europe.

3. Yea I may be thought peraduẽture, to want both face and forhead, who nether bluſh, nor am abaſhed, to preſent ſo great a Prince with ſo litle a preſent, as is a booke of paper il printed, becauſe in a ſtrange countrie, & as il indighted, becauſe by one who hath liued longer out of his countrie then in it: and euen at that time alſo, when al the Princes of the Chriſtian world, preſent your Highnes with the rareſt and richeſt guiftes, that ſea and land can afforde.

4. But if it ſhal pleaſe your Highnes, to giue eare to your loweſt ſubiect, he wil not doubt but to cleare him ſelfe of al theſe three inciuilities, which may be ſuppoſed to haue bene by him committed, and he wil count it no ſmal fauour, to be permitted to ſpeake for him ſelfe, before ſo potẽt a Prince, and dareth auouch it to be no diſhonour for your Highnes, to ſtoupe to ſo low a ſubiect: becauſe Princes, who by aſcending can mount no higher, as being in temporal Iuriſdiction next vnto God, by condeſcending to their ſubiectes, do ariſe in greatnes, becauſe therin only, they are greater then them ſelues, in ouercomming them ſelues.

5. And from the firſt the Emperour Adrian wil excuſe me, who commended vnto Minutius his Proconſul of Aſia, as a thing of importance, *Ne nomen condemnaretur ſed crimen: that the name ſhould not be condemned but the crime.* For ſayth Tertullian, againſt them that hated Chriſtians, in whom they could find no other thing to hate, but the name Chriſtian, which

Tertullian Apolig. c. 3.

which they should haue loued: *Si nominis odiū est, quis nominis reatus? quæ accusatio vocabulorum? nisi aut barbarum quid sonet, aut infaustum, aut maledicū, aut impudicum. If the name be hated what is the guilt of the name? what accusatiō is there of wordes? vnlesse they sound of barbarisme, or vnluckines, or maledictiō, or vnchastnes.* And therfore if Priesthood be no offence, the name Priest is deuoid of harme, & if Priesthood be no treasō, a Priest in that he is a Priest, can be no traitour: vnlesse we wil accoūt Christ and his Apostles traytours, who were Priestes, and the first Priestes of the new law, & esteme after the same maner, of the ancient Priestes both of England, and other countries, whom Kinges & Emperours haue honored as their worthie, and haue loued as their most faithful subiectes, who were so far frō being enemies to the crowne, that from their handes al christian kinges almost, haue hitherto receaued their Consecration, Crownes, and Scepters.

6. As for the second supposed, or rather presumed inciuilitie, that is so far from deterring me at this time, that I think now to be the verie time, when the Legates of the Kinges of earth, in their Lordes & Maisters name, wish your Maiestie a long and a prosperous Reigne, to salute you from the great Monarch of heauen, whose Legate I am, in that I am a Priest: though a miserable sinner, in that I am a man: and your Maiesties lowest subiect, in that I am an English man. Nether can I think, that the Legate of the great king of heauē, whose Legacie you shāl vnderstand anone (your Highnes wil pardon such high speaches, because it is the maner of Legates to vse them, for their Maisters honour) shal be denied audience of your so gracious Majestie, when the Ambassadours of the Kinges of earth, vvho are but his Viceroyes, Lieutenantes, and Tenantes at wil, are heard with so fauourable a countenance, and such attentiue eares. And if I were neuer so base, yet is now the time of Coronation, when it is lawful for your baseſt subiect, to congratulate your new and high dignitie,

and when the pooreſt man in the Realme, hath as good leaue to crie *Viue le Roy*, God ſaue King Iames, as any Noble man or Pere of your Realme.

7. Nether is the third obſtacle any obſtacle at al: becauſe although my preſent be ſmal and your Perſonage great, yet to accept of a ſubiectes good wil is not to diminiſh, but to agrandize your greatnes: becauſe in that, you are greater then your ſelfe, and likeſt the greateſt, who tooke in as good part the widowes mite, as the richeſt offring. But yet I would not haue your Majeſtie to eſteeme of this booke, only as of a bare bundel of papers: becauſe I preſent you withal, that humble hart, and ſincere affection, which a ſubiect can beare, or owe vnto his Soueraigne, and with my affection, I offer my ſelfe as your Majeſties moſt lowlie and faithful ſeruant: which is a guift ſo great, be the giuer neuer ſo vile, that the great king of heauen requireth, yea deſireth no more at our handes, but eſteemeth that we giue al, when we giue our ſelues, and that we giue no litle, when we giue our al, be it neuer ſo litle. Nether is my preſent it ſelfe to be miſpriſed, nether can it of ſuch a Prince, becauſe the booke is not my preſent, it is but the boxe, the preſent is that which it conteineth.

8. And if your Maieſtie demand of me what that is? I anſwere: not gold, nor Iuorie of *India*, nor rich and orient pearle, for with ſuch treaſures your Albion, like and *India*, aboundeth: but it is that which is more worth, and which your *India* only wanteth: and what is that? It is Religion: the worſhip of God, the ſaluation of your ſoule, the ſafetie of your ſubiects, the health of the body of the Realme of which you are the head, the ſtrength of your kingdome, the peace of your people, and the richeſt pearle of your crowne. This is the ſubiect of my diſcourſe, theſe are the contentes of this booke, and this is my guifte and preſent, which amongeſt ſo many guiftes that by ſo many and ſo mightie Princes are preſented vnto your Hignes, I offer with al humilitie, ho-

ping

ping, yea perſuading my ſelfe, that ſuch a guift as Religion, can not but be grateful vnto that Prince, who is the defender of the Faith, and protector of Religion.

9. And becauſe this vnhappie age hath bene more fruitful then profitable, in deuiſing of religions, in ſo much that, al is not gold that gliſtereth, ſo now al is not religiõ, which is called ſo: leſt I may be thought to offer counterfet for currant, and hereſie for true religion: it is the Catholique Religion (moſt noble Prince) which I preſent, and which this booke conteyneth, and by many argumentes as occaſion ſerueth, not only proueth, but alſo conuinceth to be the only ſincere, & true Chriſtian Religion: and vnmasking the new religion by a ſeuere, yet ſincere examination, declareth it to be nothing elſe but errour & hereſie, though vnder the painted face of a reformed religion, it hath deceaued ſome part of the world, and eſpecially your litle world, great Britanie: which the Poet choſe rather to cal a world by it ſelfe, ſeparated from the greater world, then a part or parcel of it, becauſe like a *microcoſmos* & litle world, it conteineth compendiouſly, and in a leſſer roome (which alſo is a grace) al commodities and perfections, which in the greater are diſperſed But becauſe I am more in examining & refuting the new religion, then in confirming the olde (for the good corne groweth eaſily, when the weedes are extirpated) I intitle it *A Suruey of the newv Religion.*

10. And if your Maieſtie demand of me, why I dedicate ſuch a booke vnto you? I can not want an anſwer, becauſe I can not wãt a reaſon. Flauius Vegetius wil tel your Highnes, that it hath bene euer the cuſtome, to dedicate bookes to Kinges & Emperours (as he him ſelfe did to Valentinian the Emperour) becauſe (ſayth he) nether is anie thing wel begune, vnles after God the King fauour it, nether do anie thinges beſeeme Kinges better, then bookes: who as they gouerne al, ſo if it were poſſible, ſhould know al. For as in the head *In prol. l. de remilit.*

head which guideth the whole bodie, are al the sences, so a Prince the head of the people, should be indewed with al sciences: & as the Sunne, because it illuminateth the planets which vnder it rule, & guide the inferior world, is replenished with more light then they, so the King who is the Sunne of his owne world & kingdome, from whom not only the people, but inferiour princes also, are to receaue their light and direction, should be illuminated vvirh a greater light & knowledge, then anie of his subiectes: and therfore Cirus vvas vvont to say, that he is not vvorthie an Empire, who is not better and wiser then the rest: vvhich also in effect king Salomon surnamed wise affirmed, vvhen he gaue that holsome counsaile to his felow Kinges: *Si delectamini sedibus, & sceptris ô Reges populi, diligite sapientiam, vt in perpetuum regnetis*: *If you be delighted in thrones, & scepters, ô Kinges, loue you vvisdome, that you may raigne for euer.* And to signifie this by an embleme, God him selfe gaue his people for their first king, no other then Saule, who vvas higher then the rest of the people, by the head and shoulders. And seeing that your Maiestie is not only a King, but a learned king also, as by manie monumentes of your rare vvit, & learning, vvhich euen the learnedst do admire, doth plainly appeare: to whom ought I of dutie to consecrate this my worke, but to such a King, vvho for his authoritie, can protect it, and for his wisdome, can iudge of it. Yea the verie subiect of my booke which is Religion, semed to require of right no other Patron, then your most excellent Maiestie, who by office and title, are the protector of Religion, the champion of the Church, & defendor of the Faith.

Sap. 6.

1. Reg. 10.

11. This common congratulation also not onlie of your owne litle world, but also of al the Christian world, this vniuersal ioy, these triumphes, these bonfyers, which the frenchman calleth *feux de ioy*, haue moued and stirred me vp, to shew some signe also of my affection & ioy, wherwith my hart is so

ful, tha

ful, that my tongue can not be silent. Al reioice (most gracious Prince) at your Coronation, as though it concerned al, and the hope which is generallie conceaued of your graces bountie, hath not only passed your seas, but the alpes also. The world admires the sweete prouidence of the Almightie towardes your Majestie, who euen from your infancie, hath protected you from manie imminent dangers, as though he had reserued you (as no doubt he did) for the crowne of England. The world expected ether ciuil warres, or foraine inuasions, after the death of her Majestie of late memorie, because the Heire apparant was not named, and though al men had their eyes, and expectations, and desires also, fixed on your Highnes person, yet they feared that which they desired, and hoped not without feare: and yet conscience directing your Nobles, and God gouuerning their conscience, vvithout any bloud shed, vvithout contradiction, yea vvith great applause of al, your Highnes is placed peaceably in your Regal throne: &, vvhich is rare, England vvas so inamoured with your Princely vertues, & so moued by your vndoubted title, that she sent for you, as for her louing spouse, and hath betrothed her selfe so fast vnto you, that the death of your person, can not dissolue this mariage: because her mariage with your person, is the spousage with your noble posteritie. These great fauours and benedictions of the Almightie towardes your Maiestie, make the world to thinke, that God hath culled you out for some good purpose, aud that your Highnes to shew your selfe grateful vnto him, wil imploy your selfe in some honorable seruice for that church and fayth, of which you are called the Defendour: in so much that if the general voice grounded only on the great expectation, which commonly is conceaued of you, were as true as common, I should not neede at this tyme, to be the suppliant for the freedom, and libertie of your distressed catholiques.

Publike prayer in Rome for his Maiestie by the Pope his cõmandement.

12. And although your Catholique subiectes at home,

haue not yet obteined so great a benefit, yet so rich hopes, & so firme confidence, do they repose in your Graces bountie, that from the first day of your raigne, they hoped, that your Maiestie wil proue an other Moyses, who shal deliuer your realmes and kingdomes, from a worse then Egiptian captiuitie, I meane heresie, which makes the vnderstranding a slaue to errour, vnder a show of veritie, yea that you wil be vnto them an other Iosue, who shal bring them to their land of promise, the Catholique church, which is the land of al gods promises, and that after a long famine more then Iewish or Saguntine, not of body but of soule, you shal be an other Ioseph, who shal store vs by your wisdome and authoritie, with the spititual prouision of the true word of God, true faith and sacramentes, by which the soule is nourished. Yea that you wil be an other Canstantine to appease the boysterous storme of a long persecution, and to repaire the ruines of the Catholique faith & church, of your realmes of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

13. And I also armed with the same hope, & biddē by your bountie, & constrained by necessitie to be bold: in the name of al your Catholique subiectes, of whom I am the least: in the name of the catholique church, of which I am a mēber & you a defēdour, in the name of al catholique Princes, yea of al the christian world, which hath conceaued such an expectation of your gracious goodnes: in the name of the great king of heauen & earth, by whom you raigne, and by whom you were preserued and reserued for this croune & scepter: most humbly do beseech, that it would please your Maiestie, to cast a gracious regard vpon the great afflictiō of your loyal, natural, and most ancient subiectes, the Catholiques of your realme, and to bend your most compassionate eares, to their humble & suppliant petition, vvho desire nether landes, nor liuinges, nor offices, nor pardon for offences, but libertie for their cōsciences, whose restraint they count more greeuous,

then

then impriſonment, yea death of their bodies: and not to contriſtate them vvith a heauie repulſe, at this tyme eſpecially, vvhen euen theeues and murderers, are pardoned ſo graciouſly.

14. Our zeale tovvards Chriſt, & his Church, the loue of our Religion, the deſire of the ſaluation of your Maieſties perſon our Lord and Leege, of your louing Spouſe our moſt gracious Queene, of your Royal children our noble Lordes, of your Kingdom alſo our deare countrie, moueth vs to deſire your Highnes, to reſtore vvholly that religion, which your glorious predeceſſours maintained with crowne, ſcepter, & ſworde, as for the defence therof, they vvere al ſworne at their ſacred Coronation. But if it ſhal not ſtand vvith your graces pleaſure, to graunt vs ſo much, vve moſte humblye deſire on our knees, libertie only of our conſcience & religion, which the nature of both requireth. Nether (as we hope) wil your Maieſtie condemne vs of to great preſumption, for demanding that, which hath bene ſo long denyed vs, becauſe there is no preſcription againſt conſciẽce, when conſcience is inforced: and your princely prudence wel perceaueth, that neceſsitie on our part is importune, bountie on your part imboldeneth, and the religion on your moſt noble progenitours part, for which we plead promiſeth a gracious graunt.

15. For if it much skilleth, from what tree the graffe or fruite is taken, why ſhal it not much importe, to come of a catholique race? true it muſt be, which the Poet ſayth:

Fortes creantur fortibus, & bonis,
Eſt in iuuencis, eſt in equis, Patrum
Virtus, nec imbellem feroces,
Progenerant Aquilæ columbam. Hor. Flac.

I graunt that Religion is ſupernatural, and is not transfuſed with fleſh and bloud, but infuſed by God, with conſent of our wil, and operation of grace: but yet children are naturally

bent, to like of that, in which their parentes haue excelled. And truly, for zeale towards the Catholique religion, almost al the noble kinges of Scotland, vvhich vvere your Highnes progenitours, are most famous: as the Valiant and noble Malcolmus, and the blessed S. Marguerit his spouse, king Dauid who builded 15. Abbeyes, & erected 4. Bishoprikes, Iames the fourth your great grandfather, surnamed Protectour of the faith, Iames the fift your grandfather, a moste iust king, and liberal to the poore: to omit diuers others not only of Scotland, but also of England, yea and Fraunce also, and namelie that warlike and most Catholique howse of Guise, to which you are allyed: but of al, your glorious mother is most renowmed: who, as for her goodly personage, she deserued to be spouse to a king of Fraunce, and for her Princely qualities and Roial bloud, was worthy a double croune in earth: so for her zeale in religion, and more then manly Fortitude shewed for the defence of the same at her death, she deserued the theird crowne in Heauen, called *Aureola Martyrum*.

Histoire abbregée par Dauid chambre.

He vvas therfore called Rex pauperum. King of the poore.

16. Is is possible then, that your most excellent Maiestie, beholding such rare vertue in your mother, should not desire it in your selfe? or that you should not loue to liue in that religion, for which she loued to dye? I haue heard of some that were belonging to her, and entertained by her, when she was rather detained, then entertained in England, that she spent many howers in prayer, shed many teares of sorow, gaue great almes of charitie, and vsed diuers meanes of prouidence, that your Maiestie might be made a Catholique: & amõgst others she deuised the meanes, that you should be baptized, and confirmed by a Catholique Bishop. That ranne stil in her mynd, that was deepest in her hart, & ostenest in her mouth, for that she fetcherd many a sigh, & sighed out many a wish: & that also, by her last wil & Testament, she cõmended to your Maiestie, when, going to the stage to acte that bloudie

Nic Burne in his preface to K. Iames the sixt.

Tragedie

Tragedie, which she perfourmed so happilie: she commanded her man *Meluin*, to desire your Grace, in so gracious a mothers name, to serue god religiously, to defend the Catholique faith manfully, and to gouerne your kingdom peacebly: and as liuing for this she shed many teares, so dying no doubt, she offered no litle part of her innocent bloud; which as it cryeth vengeance before God against her enemies, so like a pleasing sacrifice (as we hope) it crieth for conuersion of your Maiestie, and your kingdomes, to that religion, for which it was shed. So that as saint Ambrose sayd once to saint *Monica*, who was alwayes praying, weeping, and wishing for saint Augustine her sonne his conuersion, who then was a Manichee: *Filius tantarum lachrymarum perire non potest*, I may say of your Highnes: to wit, that the sonne of such a mother, and Prince of such a Princesse, and inheritour of such vertues, such examples, such teares, such wishes, can neuer perish, that is can not but be a Catholique. This her zeale towardes religion, these her desires and wishes, these her prayers, and teares, and aboue al, her glorious Martyrdome, wil euer be before your graces eyes, to moue your hart, if not to admit wholy the Catholique religion, at least to permit it, at least not to persecute it, which she loued her selfe so wel, and wished to your Highnes, so hartelie.

lib. Cõcert. Ecclesia. Anglica.

17. And truely (most gracious Liege) such is our repose in your goodnes, that if there were no other motiues, then your glorious mothers example, your Catholique subiectes miserie, and your owne innate clemencie, we would not at al despaire of a graunt, of our petition: but seing that, the thing we request, concerneth not only our good, but your graces honour also, and the true felicitie of your kingdome, we hope cõfidently, not to suffer a repulse in that, in which your Highnes also hath a part, & for which, not only we are humble suppliantes, but your selfe also, to your selfe, and for your selfe, are an Intercessour.

18 And first, the graunt of our petition, shal be most honorable for your most Excellent Maiestie. King Lucius was the first king christian of our countrie, and the first king, that laboured in the conuertion of it, with Pope Eleutherius, by whose counsail, and preachers which se sent, he extirpated idolatrie and planted christian religion: and for this glorious facte, his name and fame, is, and euer shal be, most renowmed, both in heauen and earth. King Ethelbert was the second king, who by the meanes of Pope Gregoirie (by popes alwayes countries haue beene conuerted) & twelue Monkes of sainct Benedictes order, the second tyme restored this countrie again, vnto the same christian, and catholique religion, the which by the inuasion of the Saxons, was againe becom idolatrical, and pagane; and he is no lesse glorious, before God and men, for so honorable an enterprise. But if your Highnes shal be the third king, who shal againe reduce this countrie to the same aũcient religion, you shal be as much more glorious, and your name as much more renowmed, as heresie is worse then paganisme, & more hardly extinguished. VVilliam the Conquerour, from whom your Maiestie is worthilie descended, is reckened amongst the worthies of the world, and written in the list, and catalogue of the most warlike kinges, for that famouse conquest which he made of your litle world. But if your highnes shal get the conquest of heresie, your honour shal be as far more greater then his, as the conquest of mens soules & myndes, is more glorious, then subdewing of bodyes. In such a conquest, the warre is Christes, the victorie is his and yours, the crowne yours only, not in earth only, but in heauen also.

Beda. lib. 1 hist. Eccles. Gent. Angl cap. 4.

l. 1. hist. Ecc. gent. Ang. c. 23

Tb. 2 2. q. 10. a. 6.

19. You haue the occasion offered (o mightie Prince) by which you may make your name and fame immortal, let not such an opportunitie passe: if you can atchieue so glorious a conquest, as you can if you wil (because the body of your Realme wil follow the wil of their head) you shal be

more

more glorious, then al the kinges of England before you. If it pleaſe your Maieſtie, to ſet before your eyes, thoſe glorious champions of the church, Conſtantine, Theodoſius, Pepine, Charles, al ſurnamed great, more glorious for their victories ouer hereſie and idolatrie, then for conqueſtes of countries, more renowmed for propagating the auncient catholique religion (for is was not Lutheraniſme nor Caluiniſme which they promoted) then for enlarging their dominions: you wil eaſilie perceaue, that it is much greater honour, four your Highnes to conſort with them, rather then with Conſtantius, and Valens, thoſe Arian Emperours, enemies to that church, which they defended, & enriched, & Leo Iſauricus, & Conſtantinus Copronymus, thoſe infamous Imagebreakers. And if you pleaſe to calle to mind the catalogue of the noble kinges of England, Lucius, Ethelbert, Egbert, Oſwald, Oſwine, Alfred, and many others before the conqueſt, with Vvilliam the Conquerour, and ſo many Henries, Edwardes, and Richardes, after the conqueſt, al your noble predeceſſours: ſo mightie in force, ſo rich in treaſure, ſo noble of byrth, ſo fortunate in warres, ſo couragious in fyght, ſo glorious in victories, ſo wiſe in gouernment, ſo iuſt in puniſhing, ſo merciful in pardoning, ſo vpright in life, ſo zealous in religion; who built ſo many goodly Monaſteries, erected ſo ſtately Churches, founded ſo learned Colleges, enacted ſo holſome Lawes, and wiſe ſtatutes, and got ſo many, and ſo ſtraunge victories in Fraunce, & other countries, euen vnto Paleſtine: your Princelie wiſdom, wil eaſilie ſee, that greater wil be your honour to ioyne your ſelfe to theſe worthies, then to ſtand ſo nakedly accompanyed, with three only of your predeceſſours, who haue protected the new religion, and ruined what they haue builded: wherof the firſt was not wholly for the new religion, becauſe by Parlament, he enacted ſix catholique articles, and at his death founded a Maſſe for his ſoule: the ſecond was ſo young, that

he was

he was rather ouerruled then ruled, the laſt was but a woman: and though they wanted not guiftes of nature, which might beſeeme princely authoritie, yet for perſecuting the Catholique fayth, & following other pathes then their predeceſſours had troden, their names are not eternized with that immortal fame, which their predeceſſours haue purchaſed by their religious actes.

20. Secondly (redoubted Prince) the Catholique religion vvil be greater ſecuritie, for your temporale ſtate. For if your Highnes dare relye vpon them, who by religion, may diſobey your lawes and ordinances (as I haue in my ſixt booke demonſtrated) much more may you put your truſt and confidence, in your Catholique ſubiectes, whom conſcience and religion, byndeth to obedience. For they are taught by religion, that authoritie is of God, and that in conſcience they are ſubiect vnto it, and bound to obey kinges, though otherwiſe difficile and hard to pleaſe, not only for feare, but for conſcience alſo. And this obedience they giue not only to chriſtian, but alſo to pagan kinges, ſuch as al were, when S. Peter, and S. Paul commaunded vs to obey them. *Vvee are taught* (ſayd S. Policarpe to the Proconſul) *to giue to higher powers that honour vvhich is deuve to them, and not hurtful to vs. Vvee* (ſayd Tertulian to the Ethnikes) *pray for the Emperour, and reuerence him next to God, and more then vve do your Goddes.* To be breefe, (as I ſhould be with a king, if the matter did not enforce me to be longer then I ſhould be) giue vs (ſayth S. Auſtin) ſuch Iudges, ſuch Magiſtrates, ſuch Souldiours, ſuch Subiectes, as our religion requireth, and Princes ſhal raigne ſecurely, and their Kingdomes ſhal flouriſh more happilie, then Platoes common welth.

Cal. l. 3. Inſt. c 19. ¶ 14. l 4. c. 10. ¶ 5. 25. 27.

1. Pet. 2. Rom. 13.

Ex Euſ.

Apol c. 3. & lib. con. Scap.

Epiſt. 5 ad Marcellin.

21. And becauſe religion, good, or bad, beareth a great ſway in the rule of mans life; the profeſſours of the newe religion, muſt needes be more prone to diſobedience, and rebellion, then wee; becauſe religion, which ſerueth for a bridle

bridle to vs, is a spurte to them. Vvherfore by Catholiques, al your predeceſſours haue beene ſerued with great fidelitie, both in warre and peace: & your glorious mother, if ſhe were liuing in earth, as ſhe is better liuing in heauen, would not let to witnes, what affection ſhe hath found amongſt the Engliſh Catholiques, and would warrant your Grace, that they wil neuer be falſe to the Sonne, who haue been ſo true to the Mother. But if your Highnes doubt of our fidelitie, we wil bynd our ſelues by corporal oath, to obey your lawes in al temporal cauſes, & to defend your Royal Perſon, your deare Spouſe our gracious Queene, and your towardlie children, our noble Lordes, with the laſt droppe of our bloud: and this our oath we ſhal be contented to diuulge to al the Princes of Europe, yea al the Chriſtian worlde.

22. And as your Grace may accounte of vs as of your ſureſt, ſo not of your feweſt nor weakeſt ſubiectes: for not with ſtanding this long perſecution, we are ſo many, that as Tertulian ſayd to the Paganes, of the Chriſtianes of his tyme: we fil your Courtes, your Vniuerſities, your Cities, your Townes, your Villages, yea priſons, not for theftes or murders, but for Religion: only we haue left the Temples to the miniſters, becauſe in them is practiſed and preached a Religion, which our conſciences can not brooke. Yea a greatter part are we, then any particular ſect in your Maieſties realme, and we are linked in Religion to al Catholique Princes and countries about you, who wil be more louing neighbours, if they ſee that we their brethern, fynd this deſired fauour at your Graces handes: and the nobleſt & mightieſt of them, wilbe more deſirous to ioyne in mariadge with your Royal poſteritie: whereby how your Kingdom ſhalbe ſtrengthned, and your dominions enlarged, your Princely wiſdome eaſilie perceueth, and you haue an example in the noble Houſe of Auſtria. Your noble brother of France that now raigneth, may be a preſidēt in this matter, who though he was once an ene-

Apolog. c. 37.

mie to the Catholique religion, yet findeth more faythful correspondence in his Catholique subiectes, then in al the rest: and by permitting both, in some good sorte contenteth both, and serueth him selfe of both.

23. Thirdly (most gracious Soueraigne) to admit the Catholique religion, or at least to permit it, is your greatest safetie for your conscience. For as you are a Prince, so are you a Christian Prince, and therfore a champion, and (as the Prophet Esaie sayth) a *Foster-father of the Church*: and as the French Kinges euen from Clodoueus, the first Christian King of that Realme, haue beene called *Christianissimi*, for their good offices towardes the Catholique Church: and the kinges of Spaine, from Ferdinand, yea from Alphonsus, yea as some thinke, from Ricaredus, for extirpating Arianisme, and propagating the Christian fayth, are surnamed Catholique: so the kinges of England, from king Henrie the Eight, your Graces great vncle, for his Catholique and lerned booke written against Luther, and other his most honorable seruices, which he once performed for the Catholique Church, are called *Defenders of the Faith*, that is, the Catholique faith. VVherfore your Maiestie, first because you are a Christian King, Secondly because you are a *Defender of the faith*, are to see that the right worship of God, and the true Christian Religion be practised in your Realme. This the honour of God, vnder whom you raigne; this the good of his Church, whose Champion you are; this the saluation of your people, whose King you are; this the spiritual health of the body of the realme, vvhose head you are requireth. For if in any countrie it be true, that the people changeth with the King, in England it is most true, as we haue seene by diuerse changes of religion, in this vnhappie age: and so in your Maiestie it lyeth, to saue or not to saue your people, which so admireth your authoritie, & Princely vertues, that your vvil is their lavv, and your lavv their rule of religion.

Cap. 49.

Genebrar. l. 3. Chron.

Baron. to. 9. Annal.

Geneb. l. 4. Chron.

Sleid. l. 3.

Georg. Lilius in Chr. Angl.

24. And

24. And vvhere can your Grace find a ſecurer hauen, for the ſaluation of your ſelfe, and your ſubiectes, then the Catholique Church? In which ſo many Martyrs haue dyed, ſo many Doctors haue taught and preached, ſo many virgins haue liued in fleſh like Angels, and ſo many Saincte haue wrought ſo ſtrange and wonderful miracles: by which ſo many hereſies haue beene condemned, ſo many Councels called, ſo many Eccleſiaſtical lawes enacted, and ſuch goodly order and diſcipline eſtabliſhed. For which ſo many Monaſteries, Churches, Colledges, Vniuerſities, and Hoſpitalles, haue bene builded and founded. In which ſo many Emperours, Kinges, and Princes haue liued, raigned, dyed, and (as it is to be hoped alſo) haue bene ſaued: and againſt which, ſo many cruel perſequutors, in vaine haue rayſed forces, and vſed tormentes, and ſo many heretikes haue raged and railed: which is deſcended from the Apoſtles, and can proue a continual ſucceſſion of her Paſtors, and religion, from them vnto this day. VVheras the new Church began but yeſterday, and Her preachers with her, who alſo can not proue their miſſion, nor diſtinguiſh them ſelues from falſe Prophets: whoſe doctrin hath al the markes of hereſie, and is rather Antichriſtian then Chriſtian, plucking at Chriſts Diuinitie, ſpoiling him of many honourable titles, to wit, Redeemer, ſpiritual Phiſitian, Lawgiuer, Æternal Prieſt, Iudge of the quicke and dead, equalizing euery Chriſtian with him, making him an ignorant, deſperate, and damned man: which hath neither Prieſt, nor Sacrifice, nor in effect any Sacrament, no prayer, not ſo much as our Lords prayer, no, not a ſermon, according to their doctrine, nor any of the eſſential partes of religion: which is blaſphemous in many pointes againſt God, iniurious to State and authoritie, fauourable to vice, and bending to Atheiſme: al which pointes I haue proued in this booke.

25. But if your Maieſties pleaſure, or leiſure be not ſuch,

as by peruſing this booke, to informe your ſelfe, which is moſt likely to be the true Chriſtian Religion, if it ſhal pleaſe your Highnes, to command a conference or diſputation, which hath euer bene the vſual meanes to determine cõtro-
3. Reg. 18. uerſies, (as appeareth by the diſputation of Helias with Baals
Io. 8. Act. Ptophetes, of Chriſt with the Iewes, of S. Paul vvith Iewes
9. 17. 18. 19. and Gentils, and of the ancient Doctors in Councels, and
20. Aug. ep. out of Councels, with Ethnikes and heretikes) your Maieſtie
41 Ruf. l. hiſt. ſhal find diuers of your Catholique ſubiectes, both at home and abrode, vvho vvil preſent them ſelues at ſuch a diſputation, if you ſhal but pleaſe to command.

26. Laſtly ſuppoſe your Highnes ſhould perſecute the Catholique religion (as God forbid, ſo glorious a Prince ſhould receiue ſo fovvle a diſgrace) beſides the diſhonour wherwith your noble crowne and name ſhould be obſcured, beſides that you can not perſecute this religion, but you muſt make vvarre againſt your noble progenitors, euen your glorious Mother, you ſhould ſooner make a conqueſt of al the countries about you, then extirpate this Religion? whoſe nature is to gather greater ſpiritual force, vvhen greateſt furie is armed againſt it.

27. This Palmetree (ô Mightie Prince) the more it is preſſed, the higher it grovveth; this Camomile more it is troden, the thicker it ſpringeth forth. This Vvalnuttree, the more it is beatẽ the more fruteful it waxeth: this Corne by threſhing, is ſeuered from the chaffe: this Gold by a fierie perſecution, becometh purer and brighter: This Arke by a raging deluge, mounteth the higher: Theſe Iſraelites the more they are oppreſſed the more they multiply, killing of Catholiques (moſt clement Prince) is but cutting of boughes, from that tree
Pſal. 79. which reacheth from ſea to ſea, and this cutting is but lopping, the tree aftervvards in height is taller, and in boughes fuller, and this ſpilling of Catholiques bloud, is but watering of Chriſts Vinyard, in vvhich for one Catholique

cut of,

cut of, many an hundred do ſpringe vp in the place. Thoſe Neroes, Domitians, Diocletians, and Maximinians, can beare witnes of this, of which the laſt two, hauing gathered great force, and prouided al the engines and inſtrumentes of crueltie, that a cruel hart could deuiſe, made ful account of a conqueſt of the Chriſtian race, and engraued this their preſumed victorie in marble pillers in Spaine, with this Inſcription: *Dioclesian, Iouius, Maximin, Herculius, Cæſſ. Aug. ampliſicato per Orientem & Occidentem Imperio Rom. & nomine Chriſtianorum deleto, qui Remp. euertebant.* But they counted their chickins, before they were hatcht, triumphed before the victorie, gaue a blaze before their light went out, and exalted their hartes before their ruine: depriuing them ſelues of their Empire, for the diſgrace, which they conceaued in ſuch a foyle, and dying a death ſo miſerable, that it ſeemed the beginning of their Hel. And thoſe your Predeceſſors, who haue perſecuted the litle flocke of the Catholiques of your realme of England, would aſſure your grace, if they were liuing, that this litle part of the Catholique Church, foloweth the nature of the whole: becauſe notwithſtanding ſo many confiſcations of their goods, ſo many confininges impriſonnementes and baniſhmentes of their perſons, ſo many tortures and deathes of their bodyes, Catholiques and Catholique Prieſtes, are mo at this preſent in your realme, then they were fourtie yeares ſince. It muſt be true which S. Leo auoucheth: *Non minuitur perſecutionibus Eccleſia, ſed augetur* &c. *The Church by perſecutions is not dimished but augmented: and alwayes our Lords fielde is clad with a farre richer haruest, whileſt the graynes which fal, ſpring forth againe more multiplied.* And the reaſon is, becauſe that muſt be performed, which Chriſt promiſed: *Portæ inferi non prævalebunt aduerſus illam: the gates of hel shal not preuale againſt her.* Her enemies are dead, rotten & forgotten, ſhe ſtandeth ſure vpon a rocke, alwayes the more glorious, the more ſhe is aſſaulted.

Euſ l. 8. c. 13. 25. 26. 29. Zon. 3 par. Annal. Sur 10. 6. die 10. Decemb. Aldus Man. poſt Schol. in comm. Caſ. Bar. ann. 304.

Ser. in natiu. Apoſt.

Mat. 16.

28. But I craue pardon moſt humbly of your gracious Clemencie, for my tedious petition. The miſerie of our ſtate, and the importance of our humble ſupplication, required a longer, but your rare Clemencie and humanitie (which hath already wonne the hartes of your people) demanded a ſhorter. Wherfore I moſt deſire your Highnes, humbly to imagin, that in this petitiō, your Catholique ſubiectes are not alone; your noble Progenitors and Predeceſſors, your moſt glorious Mother, al the Catholique princes, to whom you are allyed, and their Catholique countries, which border vpon yours, the whole Church of God, the Saintes of your realmes, the bloud of Martyrs ſhed in the ſame and for the ſame, the miſerie of your moſt ancient ſubiectes, your Highnes honour and ſecuritie, both for the temporal and ſpiritual ſtate of your kingdomes, demand this alſo with vs. Yea this your owne ſelfe, ſo gracious a Lord towardes al, requireth of your ſelfe: wherfore vſing no other interceſſor, then your ſelfe, we deſire your Grace to harken to your ſelfe, which if it ſhal pleaſe you to do, we make no doubt of our moſt humble petition. In the meane tyme we ſhal pray to him, who hath the hartes of Kinges in his hand, to bend your compaſſionate hart towardes your Catholique ſubiectes, & ſo to rule it & inſpire it, that you may be a King according to his hart: that you vnder him may raygne long & proſperouſly in the Realme of Britanie: & he by you in his holie Church: & that ſo your Maieſtie may raigne vnder him here for a time, as you may raigne with him herafter for al eternitie.

Prou. 21.

Your Highnes moſt humible and obedient ſubiect

MATTHEW KELLISON.

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE LORDES, THE LORDES OF HIS MAIESTIES PRIVIE COVNSEL.

PLATO the Diuine Philoſopher (Right Honorable and my very good Lordes) eſtemed that common welth moſt happie, in vvhich, either a Philoſopher raigned, or the King profeſſed Philoſophie: giuing vs therby to vnderſtand, that ſuch a prince is moſt vvorthy his Crown and Scepter, in vvhom vviſdom conſpireth with power, and Mars and Pallas do ſymbolize together. For if it be true which experience teacheth, and the vviſe Lawier Baldus inſinuateth, that to the effectuating of euery thing, knowledge, wil, & power are required: much more ſhal the ſame three things be requiſit in ſo great a matter, as is the orderly gouernment of a Kingdome. Where if knowledge in a King be not to direct, wil to folow direction, and power to put in execution, nothing ſhal be brought to paſſe worthy the dignitie of a king or the good of a commonwelth. For if the Prince be only vviſe in deuiſing Lawes, but not willing to enacte them, or if he be willing to enact, but not able to put in execution, his knowledge is but mere ſpeculation, his wil is without effect, and al is in vaine. But as knowledge, vviſdom, and prudence in a Prince is the firſt, ſo is it the principal, becauſe the firſt and chiefeſt point in gouernment, is to know the common wealth: otherwiſe wil without vviſdom is vvilful, and power, vvithout knowledge hovv to vſe it, vvere as a ſword in a madmans hand. Which the vviſe king Salomon vvel knowing, demanded of the Almightie wiſdom and princely prudence moſt eſpecially; & the ſame before al other thinges he counſelleth al kinges to ſeke for, if they dilight in Diademes Thrones and Scepters. And as prudence is the Prince of al moral vertues, becauſe it directeth them and guideth them to their end, ſo ought Princely prudence to be the Prince of al

l. Multum. C. Si quis alteri vel ſibi.

3. thinges required in a king.

Cic. l. de orat.

2. Reg 3.

Sap. 6.

pruden-

Princely prudence.

prudences, because the prudence of the Subiect directeth but one, that of the Prince directeth many. And vvhere the Prince is indewed with such prudence, there the King is a Philosopher, and a Philopher is the King, and the kingdome is most happie.

2. This benediction wished by Plato, is lately to our great good happe, fallen vpon England: vvhere now a Philosopher raigneth & the King is a Philopher. VVho for his rare wisdome is an other Salomon, and for his princely prudence in gouernment (vvhich in his booke to the noble Prince, his sonne and worthy image of such a parten, he hath made known to the vvorld) semeth, and is in dede as he semeth, an other Solon, Licurgus or Numa Pompilius. But because a King is to gouerne, not him selfe only, & his owne priuat appetites, but holdeth the bridle also, by vvhich he curbeth ruleth and reyneth the wilde vntamed, and vnbrideled affections of al his subiectes: his knowledge and Princely prudence, ought to be as great as if the wittes of al his subiectes were assembled together, and put in one head: that so the members of the ciuil & politique body may be directed and gouerned by the eye and insight of this head, and that the subiectes like lesser starres, from him as from a Sunne, may borrow their light and direction.

The reason of great prudece in a King.

The necessites of Counsellers.

3. And for as much as no one man, can see al thinges, though he had as many eyes as Argus (because mans witte by nature is to narow to reach so farre and farre of, and by the ouer greedy desire of knowledge in our first parentes, is endarkned now by ignorance) he standeth in nede of Counselers, if not as eyes to see by, at least as glasses to represent to his eyes. Wherfore Moyses though indewed with heauenly vvisdom instilled from aboue, yet vsed the aduise of Iethro, yea and of the Seuentie two Ancients also, to vvhom the graue Consistorie of the Sanedrin succeded. The Romaines also had their Senators: The Assirians, Medes, Persians, and Groians had their Counsellers, without vvhose verdit no matter of moment vvas concluded: vvhose examples the kinges of Spaine, England, France, Scotland, and other Christian Kingdomes haue imbraced: in so much, that now you shal as soone find a King without subiectes, as without Counsellers. Only God is so wise, that he neither vseth neither nedeth any helpe of Counsellers in the gouernment of the Empire of the world, though in execution of the law and order, vvhich him selfe only setteth down he vseth rather the concurrence then the ayde of creatures, and secondarie causes. And although it may seme smal honour to a King, to aske

Exod. 18. *Num.* 11. *Galat. l.4.c.* 49. *Baron. to.* 1. *Annal an.* 33.

D.Tho.1.p.q. 22. *a.* 3.

God hath no Counsellers.

counsel

Counsel of his Subiectes, yet is it no disgrace to the head to vse the shoulders for supporters, yea the handes and feete also as inferior ministers, to excute that wich the head shal determine. For although the King be wiser then his Counsellers, yet may they also see some thing wich he marketh not: and so they may assist him, who by him selfe knoweth not al, and yet had neede to know al by him selfe or others, because he iudgeth al. *Mammea* Quene mother to the Emperour Senerus, told him that in changing his sentence so often by the aduise of his Senate, the Emperour and the Empire grew more & more contemptible? Be it so (sayd Seuerus) but I am sure more strong and durable. And certes, as it is a felicitie in a Prince not to be commanded, so is it a miserie, not to be wel counselled. I agree with Homer no moe kinges but one: but yet I adde also, the moe counsellers the better, and that, the king is wisest Who wil not bewise alone: because, *there health is, Where are many counsailes*. And therfore some kinges haue thought it better to leaue their sonnes vnlerned then lerned, imagining that so they would more easily giue eare to counsel: but both are better, that is wisdome to iudge, lest the king by counsel be abused, and humilitie to folow counsel, when good counsel is giuen. I grant it is a goodly thing, and almost diuine, as resembling the Souueraintie of the diuine Maiestie, to sit in a throne of Maiestie, and with a diademe on head, and scepter in hand, to command and to be obeyed, yea feared and reuerenced; but yet because kinges though they be aboue, yet are not out of the ranke of mortal men, and are not so much kinges for them selues as for their subiectes profit; and haue a king aboue them, to whom as Viceroyes, they are to render a strict account, for their good or euil gouernment; I saye that to be a King is as great a seruitude as Soueraigntie and as great a charge as honour, and his Princely Throne is rather a place of labour then ease, and his diademe as ful of cares, as pearles and precious stones, and wayeth much more then the gold and stones of which it is compacted, Yea as much, as is the charge of so many subiectes which it vndertaketh. VVherfore Princes especially, haue nede of counsellers to beare some part of their so great a burden: lest falling vnder so great a waight, they ruine both them selues and their subiects.

No dishonour to a King to vse Coũsellers.

Lampri. in vita Seueri.

Prou. 14.

4. Al which his Maiestie, our soueraigne Lord, wisely waying and considering, hath made choise of and established your Honours for his sage and secret Counsellers, wel knowing that as many

lightes put together do make a greater, so many wittes vnited do giue a greater insight in matters to be resolued, whether they be lesser wherin counsel is not to be contemned, or greater as gouuernment of kingdomes, wherin it is necessarily required: for if the King ruleth not as becometh his office and person, not him selfe only but his people also perish, and he like a *Phaeton* is ruined with the chariot, which he should haue ruled: as may appear to euidently by the ruful falles & ruines of so many solewise Roboames, who haue ruined them selues and others, because they would not take Counsel of others.

Counsellers charge.

5. But as the next honour to a king, is to be Counseller to a king, so is it the next, and peraduenture nor the next, but a greater charge. For first of al, great must be the wisdom and no lesse the experience of them, by whose aduise and counsel a king must be directed, and especially in great Britanie, where the kingdome is a world, and this King so sage and wise, as appeareth by the aforesaid booke, called the kingly guift, furnished with so witty sentéces and holsome precepts of gouuernment. The holie Scripture speaketh not to Counsellers as counsellers but rather to priuat persons: *In many thinges be thou as ignorãt & giue eare with silence, & presume not to speake in the middest of great men* But rather they are to harken vnto that of Dauid. *I speake of thy testimonies in the sight of Kinges.* Secondly that the graue aduise of Counsellers may carry credit, & no sooner touch then take, he must procure by vertue, an opinion of vertue, especially Iustice, Temperance, & other vertues which tender the common good. Far as S. Ambrose saythe: *How can he be esteemed in counsel superior, who is in life inferior.* Wherfore the Athenians knowing what a disgrace vice is to sage and witty Counsel, when one of vicious life had spoken wisely and profitably for the common wealth, they imbraced the Counsel but fathered it on another. *Is ordo* (sayth Cicero speaking of Senatours) *Vitio vacans cæteris specimen esto. Be that order deuoid of vice, be it an example to others.* Lastly as the King ought to respect more the common good of his Realme and the safetie of his people (because in that he is discerned from a Tyrant) then his owne particular: so should the Counseller in al his aduises ayme chiefly at that, as the butte of his intentions, remembring always, that worthy speach of a worthy Senator: *Salus populi suprema lex esto: the chiefest law be the health of the peop'e.* Bnt as in man there are two partes, the soule and the body, and consequently two healthes also, the one of the soule the other of the body; so are there in a Common wealth two different states, the

Βασιλικον δωρον

Eccles. 22. Psal. 118.

What vertue is required

l. 2. Offic. c. 8.

An example. l. 3. de leg.

Ar. l. 8. Polit. c. 8.

They must tender the cõmon good.

Cicero l. 2. de Rep.

one sp

one spiritual the other temporal; the one is called the Church, which ruleth the soules, the other a Kingdome, that ruleth the bodyes, and temporal causes; and the health of this is ciuil peace and order, the end is temporal prosperitie, the health of the other is Grace and Religion, the end is æternal fælicitie. And therfore the Spiritual health of the people, is as much to be preferred before the temporal good, as the soule surpasseth the bodie, the church the common wealth, Religion pollicie, heauen earth, and æternal tẽporal fælicitie And therfore to a christian counseller, the principal marke, at which he is to ayme, must be the spiritual health of the people, which is true faith and Religion.

1. States in a Kingdome. The temporal state yeeldeth to the spiritual

6. And this is the cause [Right Honourable) why, hauing dedicated this booke, vnto his most Excellent Maiestie in the first Edition, and hearing that is was not taken in euil part, and hauing good occasiõ also to print it again, partly to correct faultes escaped in printing, partely to adde some chapters, and here and there some few lines for fuller proofe & a clearer explication of that which before in some few places was spoken more compendiously, partly to satisfie the desire of many, who requested a new printe because the former bookes were to few in number; I haue presumed so much of your Humanitie, as to adde an Epistle to your Honours in this second edition: not to instruct your wisdomes, but only to put you in mynd of a farther charge then commonly is thought to appertain vnto your office. For commonly that King or Counseller, is counted fully to haue performed his dutie, if preuenting ciuil discord, and forrein inuasion, he so minister iustice, that malefactors be punished, & the iniuried recompensed. And as for Religion and spiritual health of the people, manie do thinke it belongeth only to Bishops and Clergie men, and not to the King nor Counsel. But wise Princes and Counsellers that looke better in to their charge fynd it clere, that though they be not rulers of the Church in matters of faith, yet they ought to be promotors, mainteyners, and defenders of Religion. For as euerie member is bound in his degree, to seke and conserue the health of the whole body, so a king being most excellent, is as much more bond, as God hath made him more able, to defẽd and promote by his temporal authoritie, the spiritual health & good of the Church And therfore to this al Christian kinges are sworne at their Sacring, & Coronatiõ. The Frẽch king at his coronatiõ promiseth to the Archbishop of Rhemes by a solemne oath, to minister iustice to his people, to conserue them

The cause of this Epistle.

Ambr. ep. 33. Greg orat. 17. ad Theod. Kinges and Counselers must defend Religion. To this they are vvorne. Girard li 3 del Estat p. 242.

Belfor. in vita Philip Augusti. Amb. Moral l. 11. Conc. Tol 5. c. 2. 3 4 5. Conc. Tol 6 c. 16. 17. 18. Sur in vit. S. Tho. Cantuar. Stovv in vit. Henr. 4. Liu l. 1. Dion. Cass. l. 2. Val. Max l. 1. c. 1. Romulus his lavv.

in the vnion of the Catholique Church, and to extirpat and chase out those, who by this Church shal be censured as heretiques. The King of Spaine taketh in effect the selfe same oath, as appeareth by the histories of Spaine. The like doth the King of England promise to the Archbishop of Canturburie vpon the Altar at westminster, where he sweareth that he wil defend the Catholique Church and her priueledges, that he Wil honour her Bishops and Priestes, & minister iustice vnto his people. Yea the Pagans them selues could see that this maner of care of Religion was belonging to the Prince. And therfore Romulus annexed the care of the Temple, Sacrifices, & Ceremonies vnto Regalitie. And Rome was no sooner built, but Religion was established and conserued by ciuil authoritie. And seing that your Honours are christian counsellers to a christian King: that Religion and worship of God which he is boūd to manteine by authoritie, you are to further by aduise and counsel. And therfore Romulus made this law for counsellers: *Sacra patres custodiunto*: *Let the fathers of the Senate kepe watchfully the Sacred Ceremonies.*

l. 6 Eth. 2. l. 2. hist. c. 2. In Apol. The King & State must be directed by Religion.

7 But now wheras in a machcuellians eye it may seme good pollicie to preferre temporal state before Religion, when it standeth with commoditie, neuertheles in time the end wil proue, that that is neuer gained, which is il gotten, and that the common wealth rather tottereth then standeth, which is not supported by Religion, as I could proue by many a politique and wordly wise Hieroboam. Aristotle counted it absurd that the ciuil power should dominier ouer the Goddes, that is ouer religion. And Eusebius recounteth as a thing ridiculous, that the number of the goddes in Rome, was limited by the Senat, and that therfore Christ could not be receaued as God amongst them, because it seemed not to stand with pollicie, to addmitte him as God, who was already allowed of by the peoples voice, before the Senates decree. In so much that as Tertullian obserued, God then could not be allowed to be God, vnles it pleased man to be fauourable vnto him. And next vnto this in absurditie it is, that Religiō can not be admitted vnles it please the state, nor no further then it may stand with state; because Religion should march before, pollicie should come after, and by Religion should be squared out, not Religion by pollicie. Neither is the Prince or Counseller to feare lest by giuing the precedence to Religion, state, be to much debased. For as Grace destroyeth not but perfiteth, and debaseth not but eleuateth nature, as faith ruineth not reason but leadeth

it be-

it beyond reason: so Religion is neuer contrarie to state & true pollicie, but cõfirmeth it and directeth it, yea and perfecteth it also: nether is the King the lesse absolute, because he foloweth the prescript of Religion, but then especially he raigneth, when by Religion God raigneth in him & he vnder God, and so is not one of those *Which raigne but not of God.* Cicero saith that: *Sublata aduersus deos pietate, illa virtus iustitia erga homines tollatur necesse est:* Pietie towards God being taken away, the vertue of iustice, towards men must needes be abolished. And I may adde, that Religion towards God being taken away, loyaltie towards the King and felicitie amongst the subiectes, wil not long remaine, because they wil neuer be trustie to men, who want Religion, wich maketh them true to God. *l. 1. de Nat. Deor.*

8. This booke (Right honourable Lordes) wil make playne vnto your wisdomes, which is that religion that is the health & saluation of the Realme, and it wil demonstrat by many argumentes and demonstrations, that the new Religion now current in England by authoritie, can not be this spiritual health, which you are to seeke for, but that the ancient, Catholique, & Romaine faith as hitherto it hath bene generally receued of al Christian Kinges and kingdomes, & persecuted by wicked Emperors and heretikes, for the true Christian Religion, is the only Religion, by which the King and kingdome may be saued. And can your Lordshippes being men of such wisdom, insight, and iudgement, imagin any secure stay for saluation, in that Religion, whose Founders and Preachers could neuer yet distinguish them selues from false apostles, because they could neuer alleage more for them selues, then the authoritie of their owne priuate spirite, wresting and framing the texte of holie Sripture to that wich they fancie: wich hath euer bene the only argument & Achilles, for al maner of heresies: VVhich hath al the markes of Heresie, derogateth so much from Christ, wanteth almost al the essential partes of Religion, is blasphemous against God, iniurious to Prince, law, state, and tribunal, and so fauourable to al vice and Atheisme, as by this *Survey* your Honours wil easily discouer? And if ther were no other thing in it but noueltie, that me thinke should be sufficient to bring it in discredit with so wise Counsellers. Noueltie in al gouernement law & true pollice is odio⁹, in so much that Plato would not permit so much as the change of tunes and songes: and the people called Ephori sometyme punished their Musitians for adding or changing of a string in their instruments: & the Locrians made a law, that whosoeuer would

The improbabilitie of the new Religõ.

Noueltie odious. l. 2. delege.

propose any new law, should present him selfe before the magistrate, whith a rope about his necke. But especially in Religion noueltie is to be condemned, for as Cicero sayd of the common welth, so say I of Religion, that we haue receiued it from our Ancesters, yea from Christ and his Apostles, as a Picture, to which if you adde ether lyne or colour, al his changed: yea as Aristotle sayd, that the essenses and natures of thinges are like numbers, so say I of Religion. For as if you adde or subtract from any nũber, it is no more the same, but an other number: so if you adde new articles of Religion, or detract from the old, it is no more the same, but an other, and consequently not the true Religion, because there is but one, and that one is euer the same. And the reason is because Christ planted his Church vpon a rock so firmly, that the very gates of Hel and forces of the diuel, shal neuer preuail against it, and so we are not to looke for any innouations nor down falles of Religion. And therfore seing that this new Religion is but a new deuise, an apish imitation, not so good as new turning of an old coate (for who euer heard of this Religion but only in condemned heretikes? who euer wrote of Churches builded for it, or of the seruice or ministerie or disciplin Ecclesiastical obserued in it?) it can not possibly be the stable Church & Religion of Christ. But suppose that this Religion flourished in the Apostles tyme (though no ancient monument of it, was euer seene, felt, or heard) either this Church fel, or it fel not? If it fel, the gates of hel preuailed against it, and so it was not the Church which Christ founded so assuredly vpon a rocke; if it fel not, where was it or in what new world did it flourish vntil Luthers dayes? It was, they say, but it was not to be seene. But if it were not to be seene, then was it neuer the Church of Christ, because that is built not only on a rocke, but is placed also as a Citie on an hil, and Tabernacle in the Sunne, so high, that it euer hath bene conspicuous else could it not haue bene so cruelly persecuted by the euil, nor so gloriously enriched ad beautified by the good Kinges and Emperours nether could it haue bene a place of refuge and recourse for true faith & saluation. And seing that the Romain Church hath euer flowrished from the beginning, notwithstanding so many persecutions schismes, and heresies, and hath alwayes continued glorious and conspicuous, euen in the enemyes eye, often assaulted but neuer beaten down, that must needes be the Church of Christ, or else he neuer had any Church at al, & in that only can be found the true faith and Religiõ, the spiritual health of the people, which Kinges & Counsellers

to fo

l. 3. de Rep.

Noueltie discrediteth the newe Religiõ.

An example

The reason.

Mat. 16.

Refutation of the newe Religion.

Mat. 5.

Psal. 18.

Chrys. ho. 4. de verbis Isaiæ vidid Dom.

Proofe of the old Religion.

to further. Wherfore (my Lordes) your owne doctors are enforced to confesse, that once our Church was the true Church of Christ, though afterwards (as they say) it fel. But if it was the true Church, then stil it is, & if it once stood, thē certes it standeth stil, for els hel gates had preuailed: yea they say that it is stil the true Church, & so of late it was grāted, yea so much Caluin him self cōfesseth: but yet it is now corrupted (as they say) and couered with errors & heresies. But let vs take what is granted. Is it stil the true Church? then are they heretiques who haue left it, & builded Church against Church, & altar against altar: because going forth, and breaking out, is a marke of an heretike, as in this booke is declared. *li. 2. c. 2.* Is it stil the true Church? then are her preachers the true Pastors, because the Church can no more be without Pastors, then a body whithout a head: and so the true Church and true Pastors must euer go together: and consequently your ministers are vsurpers, who intrude them selues into the true Pastors roomes & preach without commission. *See the first booke, chap. 4.* Is it stil the true Church? then out of it, neither King nor kingdome nor Counseller can fynd saluation. *li. 2. c. 4.* Is it stil the true Church, then is it not ouergrown with heresies. *li. 8. c. 8.* It it stil the true Church? then can it not erre in matters of fayth, because anie one heresie seuereth from the true Church, & as it chāgeth numbers, so doth it Churches. *See the 2. booke, chap. 4.* But perhaps they wil say our Church hath of later yeares admitted new pointes of Religion, which yet they can not proue For let thē take any point of our Religiō, be it Purgatorie, prayer to Saintes worship of Images, free wil, or the Real presence, & let them name the tyme vvhen it began, and if I proue it not more ancient then the tyme they assigne, vnlesse they grant it begune with the Apostles by whom Christian Religion was reueled, I wil yeeld them the victorie. For although some Ecclesiastical lawes & Ceremonies, heue bene added, as the Church deemed requisit for tymes & persons, & although some bookes of holie Scripture haue bene defined to be Canonical, which before were not so Canonically, & commonly knowne, & although some pointes of Religion, in Councels haue bene more explaned, yet shal our aduersaries neuer proue, that our Church did adde new pointes of faith, or diminishe the nūber of old. And so your wisdomes do easily see, what reason you haue to suggest vnto his most excellēt Maiestie, either to admitte againe the ancient Catholique Religion, which hitherto hath bene the Religion not only of England, but of al Christian kingdomes also, or at least to permitte euerie one, there to seeke his saluation, where he persuadeth him selfe to find it.

9. But

9. But peraduenture your Honours wil alleage, that notwithstanding the probabilitie produced for the Ancient Catholique Religion, yet it standeth not with your present State, and so can neither be admitted nor permitted. Alas (my Lordes) and if it were so, yet you know, and I haue already proued, that state must yeld to Religion as to a higher pollicie, vnto which it is subordinate. And I may truly auouch also, that our Religion is no enemie to state, as appeareth by so many states and kingdomes, which stil are & euer haue bene manteined by it, but is the piller and vpholder of Christian states, and of al honest pollicie. For that our Religion commandeth to honour our Prince, such as we al acknowledge most willingly King Iames to be: it teacheth vs also, not for fear only, but for conscience to obey him and his lawes in al temporal and ciuil matters, and so to giue to God and his holy Church what belongeth to them, that we forget not to yeld to Cæsar what appartaineth to him. And besides Religion, nature vrgeth vs to folow nature, that is to be kind to our countrie, & not like vngrateful byrds, to stayne the nest wherin we were hatched, nor as monstrous members to seke the destruction of that body, of which we are partes and members. what then (Good my Lordes) is the cause why we are holden in such a iealous supiscio? Is it peraduenture some strange or sauage nature, into which our Religion hath changed vs by a metamorphosis? we are men as others are, & we are as much English men as who are most, & we are more ancient Subiectes then any which his Maiestie hath, by whom al the ancient Christian kinges of England haue bene serued most faithfully, both in peace and warre, at home and abroad. Or is it the freindship which we haue with forrein Princes, who being Catholiques as we are, do tender our case as their owne, and thinke them selues not to liue at ease, when they see vs their brethern vexed with so long and so sore a persecution? But alas, is there any force of freindship comparable to the natural affection which we beare to our countrie? Zopirus the faithful seruant of Darius, knowing it to be as incredible as it seemed impossible, that any Subiecte should be false vnto his natural King and countrie, was faine to cut of both nose, lippes, & eares, and to father al this iniurie vpon his King Darius, dispairing otherwise to winne credit in seruice against his countrie. And now by this generale peace, which this peaceable king hath made, al occasions of ielousies and suspicions are taken away. For if we would contemne Religion, and put of al natural loue towards our countrie, with whem now should we con-

Cath Religiō a freind to State.

Mat. 22. Rom. 13. 1. Pet. 2. See the sixt booke.

Religion and nature vrge vs to loue our King and Countrie.

The peace made freeth Catholiques from al suspition.

Iustin. l 1. hist. in fine.

we conspire against either king or countries? vvith the Spanyard? he is now your freind, by an assured and desired league. VVith the French? He now of an old enemie, is become no new nor late freind. With the Pope, who of late hath bene holden for so great an enemie. He not as a freind only, but as a Father loueth our King, who so soone almost as his Maiestie was proclaimed, commanded publique prayer in Rome for his Maiesties prosperous succese, and by many signes and offices, hath giuen no smal tokens of his exceeding good wil and affection to his Maiesties person. Or is it becaus our Religion is contrarie to yours? you tolerate, or hitherto vvinck at diuers Religions in the Realme, which wil hardly subscribe to the Protestants religion, and so you may permitte ours also, being the Religion of al yours and our forfathers. As for our loyaltie, I trust our actes deserue, your H. H. good opinion: becaus no subiectes of his Maiestie did euer more desire to see this crowne vpon his head then Catholiques, and none shewed moe signes of hartie ioy then they at his wished coronation. Certes if hartes had windowes, as Socrates wished, or were penetrable by sight, as christal is, that their secrets might be discouered, I would not doubt but that your H. H. should see, which now iustly you may beleue, as true affection & loyaltie in the Catholiques hartes, as any subiects can beare to their Soueraigne. But perauenture your Honours do feare least by libertie of conscience the number of Catholiques would increase, and their forces with their number, and so might seeke to domineer who now are kept vnder. To this also we haue an answere, and that, as your Honours will perceue, most reasonnable. For first, if your Honours esteme of your own Religion as the truer, you must counte it also the stronger, bicause the true Religion, is *an immaculate law, conuerting soules*, and Religion hath euer been to hard for superstition, and the true faith of Christe, hath euer had the maistrie ouer al sortes of heresies: and so to feare least the Catholique Religion (which hetherto hath vanquished al heresies) should get the vpper hand of the Religion by you established, it especially being now so backed and seconded by authoritie, is to doubt of the veritie of your own Religion, but bee it that in tyme by reason of the fecunditie of our Religion, both Catholiques and Catholique Religion would encrease, yet besides that Religion byndeth vs to obedience to our Prince, such order by his Maiestie & your Honors might be takē not only with vs but with the Pope him selfe & Catholique Princes, that though our Religiō should encrease

Psalm. 18.

and we with our Religion, yet nether your forces should be diminished, nor your state impeached, nor preiudiced. And you haue a President in Fraunce to assure you of your state: bicause there the Catholiques are in number so many, and in force so mightie, that the partie of your Religion is not an handfull vnto them, and yet such is the Catholiques modestie, and respect vnto the Princes Edicte of libertie of conscience, that your partie is nether iniuried nor molested, much lesse oppressed by them, & much lesse should it bee in England where it is so fauoured by your state and authoritie. Why then, most honorable Lordes, al occasions, and iust feare to the contrarie being taken away, may not our consciences & Religion enioy some freedom and libertie, or at least toleration?

10. Truly (Right Honourable Lordes) now thinges are come vnto that passe, that although in former tymes, when you had not stricken this so firme a league with Catholique Princes abroad, you might in some sorte cloke so seuere procedings, against the Catholique subiectes: bearing the world in hand (how iustly God knoweth) that Catholiques plotted treasons, conspiracies and inuasions, with those Catholique Princes, who of iust compassion releeued vs, and consequently that we were not executed for Religion, but for treacherie & treason: & although then you might perswade the late Queene frayle and fearfull by sexe, & some forrain Princes also, vnto this so sinister an opinion: yet now we can not but conceiue better hope, of better & more gentle dealinges; partly becausse now for a Queene we haue a King, so wise, iust and moderate in al his actions, who like an other Alexander the great, alwayes keepeth one eare open for the accused cause: partly becausse by this late peace & vnion, which his Maiestie hath contriued, al occasions of such suspicions and pretences are cut of. So that now if stil you continew the execution of your so sharpe and eagre lawes, as your predecessors haue done before you, you shal giue occasion to his Maiestie, and al the Christian world, to say and see that it is Religion only against which you arme your furie, from which notwithstanding you haue hitherto disclaimed, as frō a barbarous crueltie: & so your former pretences wil grow to be, suspected, & your future seueritie wil be farre more odious; and not your selues only, but his Maiestie also, (whose name, as yet renowmed, in so infamous a persecution must be vsed) shall be much dishonoured, and we the persecuted shal be as farre more couragious, in our wonted suffering, as our cause herafter shal be so much more glorious,

Catholiques hope.

The reason.

by how

by how much it is more freed, euen from al pretence and colour of al treacherie and treason.

11. Pardon me (my Lordes) if I seeme somewhat vehement, it is a publique cause, and a general calamitie of my Catholique brethren, for which I plead: neither let it seme strange vnto you, that leauing now the King, I haue recourse vnto his Counsel, because the world is so wel perswaded of this so amiable a Prince, & Catholiques haue already found him so gracious and fauourable, that al now is thought to consist in your Honours, and that what soeuer seueritie is vsed against them, doth either al procede from you, & not from the King at al, or if from him, not from him as from his owne disposition, but as from his Counselers suggestion. It can not be vnknown to your wisdomes, what a long and seuere persecution we haue endured, and our quartered & mangled bodyes, which so lately remained on your gates, poles, and bridges, and your prisons, from which this so clement and compassionate Prince hath freed manie; & the distraction and dissipation of Catholiques goods not yet restored, yea your seuere Lawes, which as yet remaine in Vigour, are sufficient and to lamentable witnesses of the same, and sufficient motiues as we hope of a more gentle proceding. But we are not to rubbe olde sores, lest we make new woundes, but fougiuing and forgetting, and desiring God also to forgiue what so euer is past, wee most humbly supplicate, & besech your Honours, that as you respect the honour of his Maiestie, & your own also, as you tender the common spiritual good and saluation of the Realme, & as you meane to discharge your office honourably before God and men: you wil vouchsafe to worke the meanes with his most Excellent Maiestie, already so wel enclined to his Catholique Subiectes, that the Catholique Religion may be permitted vnto them, who can be induced to no other, it hauing so euident markes of the true Christian Religion, and being deliuered to them by so renowmed Prelates, embraced, cherised & maintened by so noble predecessors, lest by constraining their cōsciences, you ruine their soules, & answere for them also at that day, when euerie one, & especially counsellers, & men of place and dignitie, shal haue ynough to answer for their owne: that so (my Lordes) as in his Maiesties line the vnion of the noble houses of Yorke & Lancaster is stil continued, and by this peaceable Salomon, so general a peace is contracted, and the coniunction also of the two Realmes of England & Scotland is expected: so by his authoritie and your counsel, the Catholique Reli-

The Kinges fauour to Catholiques.

gion, in which only vnion in faith consisted, may be admitted, or at least permitted, that we with the rest of of our felow subiectes may liue peaceably & amiably as members of one body, vnder the rule & gouernment of this our one so glorious head, & that so these Realmes & kingdomes thus vnited, may be as farre more strong at home, and terrible abroade, as vertue and force vnited, is greater then the same disperſed.

But now my Paper telleth me that I haue vſed to much of it for an epiſtle, & my epiſtle blusheth to haue preſumed to play the Counſeller euen to Counſellers them ſelues, and would neuer dare to appeare before ſo graue an aſſembly, did not that wiſe King Alphonſus giue ſome hart and courage, who being demaunded whom he deemed, the beſt and ſincereſt counſellers, anſwered, the dead; meaning bookes and Epiſtles, which becauſe they haue nether hartes to feare nor faces to blush, do neuer alter their intended purpoſe, nor breake of their diſcourſe for hope of fauour or feare of disfauour, but freely and ſincerly vtter the Authours conceipt of euery mannes bounden dutie. And though the Authour may perchaunce haue erred in making his Epiſtle ſpeake ſome one thing or other, which might haue been concealed, yet he hopeth not to haue offended, becauſe he meant but well: that is, good to his Countrie, Zeale to the common cauſe, loyal dutie to the Prince, and due reſpect to his priuie Counſel, and libertie, if it may bee, of conſcience, for his afflicted Brethern.

Your Honours humble ſeruant.

MATTHEVV KELLISON.

TO THE CHRISTIAN READER.

THE inanimate & vnreasonable creatures (*Gētle Reader*) because they haue neither sufficiēt knowledge to direct them selues to their end, neither wil to moue them selues vnto it, are by the prouident gouernour & menager of al, indewed with natural inclinations, propensions, or instincts, by which they are caried euery one directly to their end, as though they knewe it, and desired it. For as the arrowe, though it know not the marke, yet, because it is directed by one that knoweth it, flyeth as directly to it, as if it knewe it, and as swiftely, as if it were in loue with it: so these creatures although they know not their end, yet because they are directed by natural propensions, and indistincts, which God, who wel knoweth it, hath put into them, ayme alwayes at their conuenient places, endes, and perfections, as if they not only knew them, but also most earnestly desired them.

Instincts of nature direct vnreasonnable creatures.

A similitude.

2. The heauens, as we see, do moue so vniformely, as though by common consent they were aggreed, to be the neuer erring dials, which measure our actions, and distinguish our tymes, and seasons. The Sunne riseth at a iust tyme, as if he were mans cocke, to cal him vp to his worke, and his candle also to giue him light by which he may see to worke: & he setteth also at his tyme, putting man in mynd, that then it is tyme for him, to take his rest, and to cease from labour. The Moone in her change, is vnchangeable, and constant in her inconstancie, and both the Sunne and Moone, are so sure moderators of tymes and seasons, that winter and sommer, spring, & the fal of the leafe, neuer change their order; not that these planets know their tyme, but because they are moued by one that knoweth.

3. Brute beastes as soone as they are able to nible vpon the grasse, can choose the hearbs, which are most cōuenient for them, as though

they were cunning herbiſtes, & you shall ſeeldome or neuer ſee them dye of ſurfitting, or miſtaking one hearbe for another: not that they know the vertues of Simples, but becauſe God hath giuen them an inſtinct of Nature, to take that which is agreable to Nature. The byrdes of the ayre keepe a certaine, and a moſt conuenient tyme for breeding, & building; and their neſtes they build as artificially, as if they were carpenters by occupation, & their young-ones they feed with that diſcretion, as if they were experte nurces. The ſpider wil not yeeld to the fisher, who as cõingly weaueth his webbe, & placeth it as craftilie to catch the flye, as he doth his net to take the heedles fishes. The Bee when the winde riſeth, taketh claye in his mouth, leſt the wind haue to great force ouer his litle body. I wil ſay nothing of the ſo wel ordered common welthes of Bees & Antes, nor of the ſtrange operations, of other liuing creatures, becauſe of them I am to treat in diuers places of my booke. Plantes and trees, ſeldome, or neuer deceiue the husband man, but after the dead of winter (al which tyme they alſo ſeemed dead) they ſend forth, firſt theyr leaues, and afterwardes their bloomes, as meſſengers to fortel the fruites, which for his labour in pruning them, they meane to beſtow vpon him. And neuer shal you ſee them bud in the middeſt of winter, but in the ſpring only, when the ayre is ſo warme, that their young ones can take no harme: not that they know the moſt conuenient tyme, but becauſe God who knowes it, hath engrauen ſuch an inclination in them.

4. But more bountifully hath the Almightie dealt with man, then with any other corporall creatures, becauſe he is more noble the them al, & is an abridgement of al: for to him he hath giuen vnderſtanding to know his God, his good, his end, and felicitie, and a will alſo, to deſire and purſue the ſame. And leſt his vnderſtanding should banguer, in approuing falshood, for truth and veritie, he hath engraued in it a natural propenſion to veritie, and leſt his wil should, embrace euil, and badde for good, she alſo hath the like inclination to good. In ſo much that as the eye ſeeth nothing but light or colours, and the eare heareth nothing but ſound, ſo the vnderſtanding aymeth only at truth, and the wil deſireth nothing elſe but good: and as the eye can not perceiue ſound, nor the eare colours, ſo the vnderſtanding can not giue his aſſent to aknowen vntruth, and the wil can not affect euil, as euil. Hence it is that we can not with hart thinke that the crow is white, or the ſwanne blacke, becauſe this is a knowen

Mãknoweth his end and good.

Mans vnderſtanding aſſenteth only to truthe.

vntruth

truth, and where neither the truth nor falsehood is apparant, there we doubt, and suspend our iudgement, which is the cause why we neither iudge the sandes of the sea, nor the starres of the skye, to be euen or odde in number, because we haue no more reason to thinke the one, then the other. The wil in like maner can not affect a knowen euil, as euil, because her obiecte is good, and therfore Dionisius Areopagita sayd, that no man intendeth euil as euil, but euen then when he embraceth vice, which is the the greatest euil, he aymeth at some apparant good of pleasure, or profit, which he imagineth in that euil. Wherfore al knowen goods, such as knowledge, vertue, & felicitie are, euery man desireth, & loueth euen in his enemie whom he hateth, though he like not of the difficulties, which are to be deuoured, before he attaine vnto them.

lib. de diuinis nom. c 4.

Mans wil affecteth only good.

5. Who now would thinke that man, ether should or could approue errors and heresies, for true doctrine, & falle in loue with vice in which is no true goodnes to be liked? But nothing is so good which may not be abused. God hath giuen man freewil, not to sinne, but to merit, which if he had not, his weldoing would deserue no god mercie, & his euil deeds should be worthy no blame, because they who of necessitie do otherwise then beseemes them, are rather to be pitied, then blamed. And yet from hence proceedeth al iniquitie, from whence vertue, merit, and laudable actions should haue had their source and beginning. He hath grafted in our nature passions of loue, feare, anger, and such like, that by loue we might imbrace good, by feare auoid euil, and by anger chastice vice and euil: and yet whilest we giue passions the head & bridle, passions rule, reason is ouerruled, man is ouerthrown, and ruined by that, by which he should haue stoode. He hath imprinted in vs a natural loue, & liking of beatitude, in so much that no man is so barbarous, who, if you aske him whether he wil be happy or no, can, or wil say, no, with hart & mynd. Wherfore S. Austin saith, that the Iester, who promised that he would tel euerie one the thing which his hart desired, had hit the nayle on the head, if he had sayd, *Omnes beati esse vultis, miseri esse non vultis: you wil al be happie, miserable you wil not be:* & yet whilest by this natural propension, we seeke for felicitie in honours, riches & pleasures where it is not, and not in God, where it is, that is made our bane which should haue beene our good.

The benefite of free wil.

The abuse.

Passions.

The abuse of them.

Al men desire felicitie.

l. 11. de Trin. c. 12.

The abuse of the loue of it.

6. And so God hath bountifully bestowed on vs vnderstanding, wholly bent to truth, & only to truth, and yet by abuse, that is made

the

The abuſe of the vnderſtãding prone to truth.

the fountaine of al errours, which should haue bene the ofspring of veities. For whileſt like Æſops dog, we ſnatch at the shadow, in ſteed of the flesh, that is, ſeeke after truth in thoſe thinges in which is no truth at al, but only a show and shadow, we make our natural propenſion which we haue to truth, a cauſe of our errour, which should haue bene our beſt direction, and with as great a vehemencie we embrace our errours, as we are propenſe and prone to truth, euen as that dog, the more greedily leaped at the shadow, the more deſirous he was of the fleſh. And hence proceede idolatries, ſuperſtitions, ſectes, and hereſies, to which we would neuer giue ſo obſtinate an aſſent, did we not imagin ſome truth to be, where only is deceite and errour.

The ſource of ſuperſtition & hereſie.

The abuſe of the Wils proclivitie to good.

He hath giuen vs alſo a will, wholy bent to good, and altogether auerted from euil: and yet whileſt with thoſe fooliſh byrdes, we pecke at *Zeuxis* painted grapes, that is ſeeke after good in pleaſures, riches, & honours, where is but a painted hewe of good, we embrace vice our greateſt euil, in ſteed of our greateſt good, & ſo much the more greedily, by how much we are more inclined to good. And hence proceede fornications, aduouteries, theftes, and murders, which we would neuer deſire ſo vehemently, did we not apprehend in them good, that is, pleaſure or profit. So that the banquers of our wil, proceed only from miſtaking of badde for good, & the errours of our vnderſtanding, procede not from any prones which we haue to vntruthes, but from miſtaking of apparant, for true verities.

The fountain of al vice.

7. And this is the cauſe (moſt gentle Reader) why I haue made ſo exacte a Surucy of the new Religion, becauſe I know thy vnderſtanding to be ſo naturally inclined to truth, and ſo auerted from al vntruthes and errours, that to lay open vnto thy vew, the manifold & groſſe abſurdities, which it implyeth, is to refute them, and to make them knowne vnto thee, is to diſſuade thee from them. For truly I find many pointes of this Religiõ, ſo oppoſit to light of reaſon that I dare auouch, that no man can be either Lutheran or Caluinist vnleſſe he want wit, or hauing wit, enter not into conſideration, or be caryed away with paſſion, or partial affection. I wil not deny but that many a good wit may be found amongſt the Profeſſours of this Religion, but yet I ſay, that theſe good wittes, if they layed aſide paſsion and partialitie, and would vouchſafe to enter into due conſideration, could be neither Lutherans nor Caluiniſts, becauſe in euident vntruthes the vnderſtanding can giue no aſſent nor approbation.

8. A

8. And vvhat more euident vntruth then Lutheraniſme or Calniſme? Firſt of al their preachers can ſay no more for proofe of their authoritie or doctrin, then Simon Magus, Ebion, Cerinthus, Baſilides, Neſtorius, Eutiches, Vvicleph, or any other Heretike could haue ſayd, and euerie falſe prophet hereafter may ſay, preach he neuer ſo abſurdely, as I haue demonſtrated in the firſt booke moſt euidently. For neither can they proue their miſſion to be ordinarie by ſucceſſion, nor extraordinarie by miracle: & ſo if you giue eare to them, you muſt bynd your ſelfe to harken to al falſe prophers, who wil ſay & ſweare that they are ſent from Chriſt, & if you put them to the proofe of their miſſion, they wil ſay you are partial, in reiecting them, and receiuing Luther and Caluin, who can not proue their miſſion. But no man can with any ſhowe of reaſon admitte al falſe Propheres, becauſe they teach playne contraries, ergo he can haue no reaſon to receiue Luther and Caluin, as the true meſſengers and miniſters of Chriſt: and conſequently, he can not in hart receiue them, becauſe the vnderſtanding can not approue a thing, for vvhich it hath no probable reaſon.

The abſurditie of the new religion.

The firſt argument.

Al heretikes ſay as much for them ſelues, as theſe of our time.

9. Secondly their doctrin, if it be wel conſidered, is as euidently falſe, as that vertue is vice, or black is vvhite, but the vnderſtanding (as is already proued) can not approue manifeſt falſehood and euident vntruthes, ergo no man of vnderſtanding and conſideration can admitte Luthers and Caluins doctrin. Now that their doctrin is euidently falſe, I can both euidently, and alſo eaſily proue. For to a Chriſtian it is euident, ſuppoſing the veritie of Scripture, that hereſie is errour and falſehood, but in the ſecond booke I haue demonſtrated, that al the markes of hereſie agree as fitly to this new doctrin, as to Arianiſme or any old hereſies, ergo to a Chriſtian it is euident, that this new doctrine is errour, and conſequently it can not be approued by a Chriſtian of iudgement and conſideration, becauſe the vnderſtanding can not giue aſſent to an open vntruth.

The ſecond argument.

Al the markes of heretikes agree to theſe nevv preachers.

10. It is euident alſo to a Chriſtian, that Antichriſtian doctrin, vvhich is diſhonorable and repugnant to Chriſt, can not be true, but Lutheraniſme and Caluiniſme is altogether oppoſit to Chriſt, becauſe it pulleth at his Diuinitie, & maketh him nether Redemer, nor ſpiritual Phiſitian, nor Lavv maker, nor eternal Prieſt according to Melchiſedechs order, nor Iudge of the quicke & the dead, but rather vilizeth euerie Chriſtian to him in grace and ſanctitie, and maketh him ignorant, fayneth him alſo to haue deſpaired, yea bringeth him to hell & dãnation, & litle eſteemeth manie thinges, which were much

The third.

Their doctrin is antichriſtian.

beloued of him, or belonging to him: al vvhich the third booke conuinceth, ergo a Chriſtian of vvitte and conſideration, can not in hart brooke ſuch a religion.

The fourth. 11 In like maner to a Chriſtian, yea to euery man that beleueth that there is a God & relgion, it is euident that Religion can not ſtand without Prieſtes, Sacramentes and prayer: but it is euident alſo, that in the newe religion, none of theſe eſſential partes of religion can be found, eſpecially according to the doctrine of the ſame Religion, as the fourth booke maketh manifeſt, ergo a Chriſtian of vvit and dewe conſideration, can not approue it for true Religion.

The fifth. 12. Againe as euident it is, that the new religion is abſurd, as that God is not the author of ſinne, and the only ſinner, that he is not vnreaſonable, cruel or tyrannical, for according to the reformed doctrine, al theſe blaſphemies are verified of God, as the fifth booke teacheth, ergo the reformed doctrine is euidently abſurde.

The ſixth. 13 Likewiſe it is euident to reaſon, that al lawful authoritie is of God, that Princes lawes binde, that their tribunals are iuſt and lawful, and that correſpondence betwixt the Prince and Subiectes, and betwixt one ſubiect and an other is neceſſarie to vphold ſocietie, to vvhich God and nature encline vs, vvhich is proued in the ſixth booke: but the reformed doctrine deſpoileth Princes of authoritie, bringeth their lawes and tribunals in contempte, and ruineth al Societie, as is euidently alſo proued in the ſame booke, ergo a man of common ſenſe and iudgement, who entereth into a dewe conſideration, can not with hart admit of this religion.

The ſeuenth and eight. 14. Vice & Atheiſme, by light of reaſon, are euidently knowne to be repugnant to reaſon, vvherfore ſeing that this new religion leadeth to al vice, and Atheiſme, and that by many pointes, and principles of the doctrine of the ſame, as in the ſeuenth and eight booke is demonſtrated, it is an euident abſurditie, euidently repugnant to reaſon, and conſequently can not be approued by a man of reaſon and conſideration, becauſe the vnderſtanding can no more aſſent vnto an euident vntruth, then can the wil affecte and like of euil, as I haue already proued.

The authors deſire. 15. Wherfore (moſt gentle Reader) if thou be a Catholique, and vouchſaffe to peruſe this booke, I hope thou ſhalt be more confirmed: if thou be a folower or profeſſor of the new doctrin, when thou ſeeſt the fowle abſurditie thereof, and the clere veritie of the Catholique, I hope thou wilt reiecte thyn erronious opinions, and imbrac

brace the only true Catholique Religion. And if this my desire haue successe in anie, the prayse is al dew to God, who is principal agent: the defects or faultes are myn, I is vnweldie instrument. If anie reape cõmoditie by my laboures, I count them very wel bestowed, & it is the reward I looked for. If some that may wil not, yet they are not lost, *quia aliquid est voluisse*, it is something to haue desired to do good.

16. If the stile please thee not, refuse not gold because it is il fashioned, and remember, that though the author be thy countriman by byrth, yet he is more a stranger then an Englishman by education. If I seme to speake to sharpely some tymes, it is not for any tooth against anie person, but for hatred of heresie. And if thou take this my impolished vvorke in good worth, thou wilt giue me the occasion and courage to take in hand an other, in vvhich I shal explane (as I haue in part already) certaine pointes of the Catholique Religiõ (to wit Indulgences, Merite, Satisfaction, vvorship of Saintes, Images, and Reliques, with many such other) vvhich seme to the deceiued, to imply iniurie to Christ, or absurditie, as I haue discouered the grosse errors of the new Religion. *his excuse.*

17. But now for a Vale & frendly farewel, I besech thee to take this counsaile at my handes. Build not vpon that, not so flattering as false opinion, wherwith many vse to comforte them selues, that thou maiest be saued in any religion. The second booke wil assure thee, that vvithout a true and intier faith, it is impossible to please God, and that out of the true Church, there is no saluation. As God is but one, the truth but one, so his Religion, Church, and worship is but one. This Church and Religion is not to be found amongst the reformers, because they haue al the markes of heresie: It is only to be found amongst the Catholiques, who are nicknamed Papistes, as thou myest see in the second booke, and in some chapters of the first, and by the other bookes euidently demostrated. *His counsaile to the reader.*

18. The Catholique Church then is the hauen of securitie, and the porte of saluation, to which thou must repayre, the arke wherin Noe lodgeth & his familie, that is Christ and his faithful people, it is the barne vvhere the good corne is layed vp, til the vvinowing day, it is the folde of Christes sheepe, the piller of truth, the treasure-house of Christs Graces, the shoppe of spiritual negotiation, the land of promise, the paradise of the second Adam, the temple of the second Salomon, the mystical body of Christ, the terrestrial heauen of those that hope to be blessed, the only vvay to life euerlasting. If then thou *The Catholique Church is the only place of safte and hapines.*

deſire to be free from tempeſts, and contrarie vvindes of diſagreing hereſies, direct thy ſhip and ſaile to this quiet hauen, if thou wilt not make ſhip wrake of thy ſoule, fly to this porte of ſaluation, if thou wilt not be drowned in the deluge of ſinne or Infidelitie, haue recourſe vnto this Arke, out of which none can eſcape damnation: if thou wilt be of Chriſtes choſen corne, repoſe thy ſelfe in this hi barne, which is the only place of purging from the chaffe, if thou wilt be one of Chriſts flocke, be in this folde, that thou mayeſt be fed with his ſhepe: if thou wilt be ſure of the truth, kepe thy ſtanding vpon the piller of truth: if thou wilt be enriched with Chriſts ſpiritual treaſures, this is the treaſure houſe of al his graces. if thou wilt traffique for heauen, and heauenly merchandiſe, enter the ſhop of Chriſt his Church, the only place of merite, and Chriſtian negotiation: if thou vvilt be partaker of Chriſts promiſes, dwel in the land of al his promiſes: If thou vvilt enioy true felicitie, enter into this paradiſe of the ſecond Adam: if thou wilt honour God with true Sacrifice and worſhip, this is the only Temple, out of vvhich nether prayers, nor oblations, not ſacrifices are pleaſing: If thou wilt receue any influence, and motion from Chriſt the Head, incorporate thy ſelfe to the Church his myſtical body: and if thou vvilt be partaker of his ſpirite, which is the ſoule and life of this body, diſmember not thy ſelfe, but endeuour to be a liuely member: if thou wilt enioy the bliſſe of Angels in the vpper heauen, enter firſt into this lower heauen, out of vvhich is no hope to aſcend to the higher: if thou vvilt attaine to life euerlaſting, paſſe by the Church, for it is the only vvay: If thou wilt be one of the Church triumphant, be firſt one of the Church militant: and if thou wilt haue God for thy father, take his Church for thy mother. Nothing more dangerous then to liue out of this Church, & no ſurer damnation, then to dye out of this Church. Be not careleſſe therfore in ſeeking out this Church, & vvhen thou haſt found it differre not thy greateſt affaire, a matter of moſt importance, becauſe theron dependeth, not a temporal ſtate of thy bodie, but eternal ſaluation or damnation, both of body and ſoule. Farewel, and pray for him that prayeth and laboreth for thee, that thou mayſt do wel. Iul. 18. an Dom. 1603.

Extreme danger to liue out of this Church. aſſured damnation to dye out of it.

MATTHEVV KELLISON.

A table of the particular contents of these eight bookes: and of euerie chapter therof.

THE first booke conteineth a Survey of the groundes, on which the pretending reformers of Religion seme to build, and maintaine their doctrine: and proueth that they haue no sufficient fundation at al, but such as openeth the way to al Heretikes & Heresies.

Chap. 1.

The preachers of the new religion can not proue them selues to be sent from Christ, vvhich vvere absolutly necessarie: els none may geue eare vnto them, vnles they wil harken also to al false Prophetes and Preachers.

Chap. 2.

As pretense of bare & onlie Scripture is a special ground of this new religion, so is it of al other heresies, serving them al, as much as these of our time: and therfore is not a cõuenient ground of Religion.

Chap. 3.

Much lesse is the priuate spirite (vvhich these men make supreme iudge in vnderstanding Scripture) a ground of faith or Religion; but in dede bringeth in al heresies, and serueth al Heretikes, that haue bene, or may be.

Chap. 4.

By refusing the ancient Fathers & Councels, for vnderstanding and expounding holie Scriptures, the pretended reformers geue entrance to al Heretikes.

Chap. 5.

These new preachers haue no probable meanes to induce a reasonable man to their religion: and therfore vvhosoeuer wil credite them, may as wel credite anie other Heretike, teach he neuer so absurde and phantastical paradoxes.

Chap. 6.

In that they haue no visible Iudge in matters of Religion, they open the way to al Heretikes. Who may preach vvhat they list, hauing no Iudge to controle them.

Chap. 7.

These new pretended christians know no end in beleuing: and therfore vvhosoeuer receiueth their Religion, shal neuer be setled, but alwayes seeking and yet alwayes to seeke.

THE

THis second booke contayneth a Suruey of the markes of Heretikes. Which are proued to agree so fitly to the professors of this new Religion, that if euer there were anie Heretikes, these are Heretikes. *Chap.* 1.

Breaking out of that Church, vvhich is commonly counted the true Christian Church, is the first marke, & agreeth euidently to the pretended reformers. *Chap.* 2.

Later standing and noueltie is an other marke of Heretikes, and agreeth to the pretended Gospellers of this time, as fitly as euer to anie heretikes of former times.

Chap. 3.

A particular name taken either from the Maister & beginner of a Sect, or of the particular doctrin, or some particular accident, is an other marke, and agreeth to these new preachers, who can not be knowen by the common names of Catholique or Christian.

Chap. 4.

Renewing of old condemned heresies is a fourth marke: and agreeth also to these of our time, shewing them to be heretikes: and that also for errors long since condemned.

Chap. 5.

Want of Succession is a most notorious marke of Heretikes & false prophets: and agreeth most euidently to the pretended Gospelers of this time. *Chap.* 6.

Dissension in doctrin, from their owne first maisters or pretended reformers, and diuision into manie Sectes, one contrarie to an other in substantial points of faith, is an other marck: & is most cleer in these young Maisters lately sprong out of Martin Luther.

Chap. 7.

To be a seueral congregation, of some particular place, or of small continuance of time, is an other special marke of Heretikes: & agreeth to the new reformers, who neither haue possessed al ages and countries, nor yet one hundreth yeares, nor euer anie one whole kingdome or countrie.

Chap. 8.

To be condemned for Heretikes by that Church, which is commonly counted the true christian Church, as these of our time be, is an other sure marke, that they are Heretikes.

THE

THE third booke contayneth a Surucy of the new doctrin concerning Christ. Where is clerly proued, that these new maisters are rather Antichristianes then Christianes.

Chap. 1.

Their doctrin spoyleth Christ of his Diuinitie, whereby they shew them selues not to be sincere Christians.

Chap. 2.

Their doctrin, that by Christs redemption no law bindeth, no sinne hurteth, so one beleue that he shal be saued, maketh Christ an absurde Redemer. *Chap.* 3.

If their doctrin were true, that none is, nor can be truly iust, but so imputed only, and that in dede the iustest man is a damnable sinner, that is, the slaue of the diuel, then Christ were no Redemer at al.

Chap. 4.

In that they teach, that Christ doth not heale, but only couer the wound of sinne, they make him no spiritual Phisitian.

Chap. 5.

The new Gospellers, Luther expressly, Caluin by consequence of doctrin, teach that Christ is not a Lawmaker.

Chap. 6.

Lest they should be forced to confesse, that the Masse is a proper Sacrifice, they denie that Christ is an eternal Priest, according to the order of Melchisedech. *Chap.* 7.

Seing those that beleue not are already iudged, and by the new Gospellers doctrin, no other sinne is imputed to a beleeuer, no reward of good vvorkes, because they say there is no merite, neither anie discussing of vvorkes, good or badde, for they say there is no difference, they take from Christ the whole office of a Iudge.

Chap. 8.

In that they teach, that euerie beleuer is reputed iust, by the selfe same iustice, by vvhich Christ is iust, they make euerie one reputed as iust as Christ him selfe. *Chap.* 9.

Most of the new maisters, namely Luther, Caluin, Beza and others say, that Christ vvas ignorant of some things.

Chap. 10.

Caluin and his disciples affirme, that Christ feared the sentence of damnation, and for the time despayred of his owne saluation.

Chap. 11.

Chap. 11.

Caluin and his folowers say, that Christ suffered the paines of hel in his soule. and so make him companion of the damned.

Chap. 12.

The new Gospellers can not indure the honour of such persons & things, as belong most specially to Christ, by which & al the former derogations from him, is manifest, that they are no sincere Christians.

THE fourth booke contayneth a general Suruey of the new reformers religion and worship of God, vvherin is proued, that either they haue no religion at al, or a graceles religion.

Chap. 1.

Forsomuch as Priests and Religion went alwayes together, the new Gospellers admitting no Priests nor Priesthood, haue therfore no religion. Chap. 2.

Likewise denying & reiecting al proper Sacrifice, as they do, they can not possibly haue anie true Religion.

Chap. 3.

Some Protestants denying more, some fewer of the seuen Sacraméts, they al detract so much therby from Religion, as they diminish the number, and valure of Sacraments, which necessarily alwayes goe with Religion. Chap. 4.

Holding that Sacraméts are bare signes, only to distinguish Christianes from Infidels, & denying that any grace at al is geuen by them, they make Sacraments of smal importance, and therby shew their owne graceles religion. Chap. 5.

The Protestants of England granting only two Sacraments in name, but denying the effectes of them both, neither confessing that sinne is forgeuen by Baptisme, nor Christ to be really present in the Eucharist: and so in effect haue no Sacraments at al.

Chap. 6.

According to Protestantes doctrin there should be no prayer at al vsed, no not our Lordes prayer, for that (as they say) it neither satisfieth nor meriteth anie thing, & repugneth with diuers other pointes of their assertions, nor yet anie sermon by their opinions.

THE

THE fifth booke contayneth a Suruey of the new Maisters doctrin concerning God. Where is declared that they are most impious and iniurious to the Diuine Maiestie.

Chap. 1.

They make God the author of al sinne and wickednes.

Chap. 2.

God were not only a sinner, but the onlie sinner, and men not diuels no sinners at al, if Protestants doctrin were true.

Chap. 3.

God were an vnreasonable Prince, if the Commandements, which he geueth, were vnpossible to be kept, as Protestants teach they are. *Chap.* 4.

Yea God were a cruel Tyrant, in condemning men to euerlasting damnation, for not obseruing his commandments, if the same were vnpossible to be obserued.

Chap. 5.

By these false and horrible opinions of God, they frame to them selues such a God, as in dede is not: & so adore an Idol of their owne imagination, in steede of our Lord God.

THE sixth booke conteyneth a Suruey of the Protestants doctrin concerning Kings & Princes. Shewing how they spoile al Princes of authoritie, and bring their lawes in contempt.

Chap. 1.

In that they teach, that no Prince, nor Superior can bind anie subiect in conscience, to kepe his law or commandment, they both diminish the Princes authoritie, & take away the chiefest obligation from subiects, vvarranting them, in respect of sinne or conscience, to disobey, yea to rebel, if they list and be strong ynough.

Chap. 2.

By this doctrin, that Princes lawes bind not in conscience, Iudges & Iudgement Seates are only respected for temporal feare, not for the offence of God. *Chap.* 3.

Likewise by this doctrine al lawes lose their force, and are in respect of conscience, but as consailes, which the subiects may choose whether they wil obserue or no, and so are easily contemned.

Chap. 4.

If lawes did not bind in conſcience, Princes ſhould haue no other but temporal confidence in their ſubiects. Subiects would ſtil feare oppreſſion, & tyrannie, and ech man vvould ſuſpect others: & ſo al mutual truſt would decay, and al ciuil ſocietie periſh.

THE ſeuenth booke conteyneth a Suruey of the new doctrin concerning maners. Where is declared, that it maketh way to al vices and ſinnes. Chap. 1.

By preaching againſt the hope of heauen, & feare of hel, which are moſt frequent in holie Scriptures, and al the Fathers, they bring in al ſlouthfulnes to vertue, and prones to ſinne.

Chap. 2.

The doctrin, that only faith iuſtifieth, doth alſo make vvay to vice, and taketh away the care of doing good vvorkes, as nothing worth. Chap. 3.

But eſpecially by that falſe perſwaſion, that euerie one muſt aſſure him ſelfe, that he is elected, and that he ſhal be ſaued, it leadeth to extreme preſumption, and looſeth the bridle to al iniquitie.

Chap. 4.

In faying as they do, that faith maketh no ſinne to be imputed, they gene leaue to al that ſo beleue, to commit al ſinne & wickednes.

Chap. 5.

Againe teaching that al mens actions are mortal ſinnes, they bring their folowers to vtter deſpaire of doing wel, vvherby they are induced into al vice. Chap. 6.

The ſame deſperate occaſion of running into al vice is geuen by their falſe doctrin, that man hath no freewil, but doth of neceſſitie and conſtraint, whatſoeuer he doth.

Chap. 7.

Auouching that Gods commandments are impoſſible brideth the ſame deſperations. Chap. 8.

Likwiſe in ſaying that Chriſt hath fryed al men, that they need not kepe the commandments nor lawes, openeth the gate to al vice.

Chap. 9.

Alſo in making God the author & worker of al ſinne, they take away al feare of ſinning, and embolden men neuer to reſiſt any tentation.

Chap. 10

Chap. 10.

Againe by denying the obligation of lawes, and freewil; and by saying that al actions, euen the best are mortal sinnes, yet that no sinne is imputed to him that beleueth, and that God is the author of sinne, they say in effect that there is neither vertue nor vice in mens actions.

Chap. 11.

It foloweth also of the forsaid groundes, that none nedeth to make anie conscience of sinne. Which being taken away, they that hope to auoid the eye of the Magistrate, or are able to resist his authoritie, neither yet feare Gods punishment, so they beleue to be saued, may sinne without feare.

Chap. 12.

In particular the forsaide opinions set open the gate to pride.

Chap. 13.

Also to idlenes, yea by their onlie faith, and assurance of saluation, they make idlenes the perfection of Christian life.

Chap. 14.

Their doctrin is so opposite to virginitie, that it also impugneth vidual yea and coniugal chastitie.

Chap. 15.

Finally, this new doctrin by exacting an impossible beleefe of a sinner, that he is iust, before he be iustified, for this beliefe they say is the cause of iustificarion, & so must goe before, holdeth him so fast in sinne, that being once fallen he can neuer rise againe.

THE eight booke conteyneth a Suruey of the new doctrin, declaring how it leadeth to Atheisme. Which is an vglie monster, not only as it denieth God in plaine termes, but also as it lightly esteemeth of Religion & seruice of God; preferring worldlie estate before Gods seruice. Both vvhich sortes the heresies of this time do bride.

Chap. 1.

Notwithstanding it is euident by manie arguments, that there is a God, Maker & Maister of al other things, yet the Protestants doctrin teacheth and describeth God to be such a one, as he neither is nor can be: as to be the author of sinne, vnreasonable, cruel, tyrannical, so that a reasonable man wil rather thinck there is no God at al, then such a God.

Chap. 2.

Chap. 2.

The forsaid doctrin & false conceipt of Gods goodnes & mercie taketh away the vertue of Religion, & al affection to serue God, which prepareth the way to thinck there is no God.

Chap. 3.

By contemning the Churches authoritie, for declaring and defining vvhich Bookes are Canonical Scripture, and the word of God, they take away a chiefe ground of al Religion, and so bring in Atheisme.

Chap. 4.

In that they admite some Bookes of holie Scripture, yet reiect others, hauing as assured proofe for al as for anie, they bring al in doubt, and so open the way to contemne al Scripture, and our whole Religion.

Chap. 5.

Their dissention of doctrine in chiefe points of Religió, geueth direct occasion to denie al their new assertions, and so if there were not a certayne doctrin besides, and before theirs, it would lead men to discourse to denie al Religion, and to professe Atheisme.

Chap. 6.

The vvant of one visible head, to kepe vnitie in Religion, allowe-th euerie one to be of what pretended Religion he wil, and not finding one more probable then an other, he may by the same liberti be of none at al.

Chap. 7.

Denial of Christs real presence in the blessed Sacrament, which is the greatest Sacrament, & the only Sacrifice of Christian Religion and is clerly proued by the very letter of holie Scriptures, maketh the way to denie al other Mysteries also, and so to depriue the vvorl of the onlie true Religion, and to bring al to Atheisme.

Chap. 8.

The last chapter recapitulateth the chiefest things proued, and disproued in this vvhole booke: shewing how deformed, and defor-ming the congregation of the new pretending Reformers is: with clere and euident proofe, that the Catholique Romain Church is the only true Church. and that out of the same there is no saluation. Exhorting therfore the christian reader, to liue & dye a membe therof.

FINIS.

THE FIRST BOOKE CONTEINETH A SVRVEY OF THE GROVNDES AND FVNDATION OF THE NEW RELIGION.

The first chapter examineth the mission of the preachers, of this nevv religion, and shevveth, that they can not proue themselues, to be sent from Christ, & that consequently vve can not giue eare vnto them, vnles vve vvil harken also to al false prophetes.

HARDLY shal we finde a subiect so disloyal, or priuate man so imprudent, vvho vvil arrogate vnto himselfe the honourable office of an Ambassadour, to deale betvvixt Prince and Prince, in denouncing vvarre, or offering peace, or in establishing a nevv league, or renewing an olde, vnles he haue authoritie from his Prince, in vvhose name he dealeth, and can by letters of credit, or other tokens make an euident remonstrance of his legantine povver and commission. For if he go vnsent, he abuseth his Princes name, and if he can not shevv his commission, he runneth on a sleeueles arrande. If this be so (as experience teacheth vs that it is so, and reason telleth vs that it must be so) and that betvvixt man & man, vve haue no reason to think Almightie God to be so deuoid of Princelie prudence, as to send his Apostles and Preachers, to denonnce his vvil, & to impert his minde to his people, and not to giue them vvithal, letters patentes of their comission: or to be so vnreasonable, as to binde vs to giue credit, or audience to such Ambassadours, vvho can only bragge of their embassage, but can not by any probable proofes, acertaine vs of it. For so vve might imbrace a false

Vvhat is requisit in an Ambassadour.

Preachers & Pastors must be sent.

Moyses vvas sent. a false preacher & Apostle, vvhen in dede vve haue a lewd and lying prophet by the hand.

Exo 3. 2. This Moyses vvel knovving, neuer dreamed of that great embassage, in vvhich he vvas sent from God to Pharao, to deale for the deliuerie of the oppressed Israelites, vntil God had called him, and tolde him that he intended to send him: knovving that if he should haue gone vnsent, he should haue abused his Lord and maisters name.

Aaron vvas sent. Aaron also durst not aduenture vpon priestlie function, before that Moyses by Gods cõmandement, had consecrated him. Whose example

Exod. 28. S. Paul proposeth vnto al Pastors, as necessarie to be folowed, saying:

Leuit 8. *Nec quisquam sumit sibi honorem, sed qui vocatur à Deo tanquam Aaron: Neither*

Heb. 5. *doth any man take vnto him selfe honour, but he vvho is called of God as Aaron*

The Prophets sent. *vvas.* The prophets likewise, presumed not to tel vnto the people Gods mynd and wil, nor to fortel the thinges to come, of which he would

Angels sent. haue his people forewarned, without an expresse commandement

Psal 103. from him, as may appeare by the proeme and beginning of their pro-

Greg hom 34. phecies. And those immortal creatures, which are by nature spirites,

Dan. 10. are by office called Angels, because they are sent from God, as his le-

Luc. 1. gates, & Ambassadors, for so much the greeke word ἄγγελος implyeth,

S. Iohn Baptist sent. from vvhich our English vvord *Angel*, is deriued. Wherfore the Angel

Malach. 3. that came to Daniel, declareth vnto him his commission, before he

Luc. 1. telleth him his message. *Daniel*, saith he, *sta in gradu tuo, nunc enim missus*

Ciril lib in Io. c. 17. *sum ad te: Daniel stand in thy place, for novv I am sent vnto thee.* And S. Luke

Beda in c. 1. Mar. describing that great ambassage of the Archangel Gabriel, vnto the

Ioan. 1. blessed virgin Marie, saith that he was, *Sent from God into a citie of Galilie,*

Theoph. in c. 3. Luc. *vvhich vvas called Nazareth, vnto a virgin despoused vnto a man, vvhose name vvas Ioseph.* In like maner S Iohn Baptist the Precursor of Christ, and more then a prophet of God, who not only foretolde the Messias, but also poynted him out with his finger, is called an *Angel*, not because he was an Angel by nature, as Origen imagined, but because he vvas an Angel by office, as being sent to make the way and to prepare it for the Messias. Wherfore S. Iohn the Euangelist reciting the prayses of S. Iohn Baptist saith, that he was *a man sent from God.* And Theophilact explicating these wordes of S. Luke: *Factũ est verbum Domini ad Ioannem: the vvord of God vvas made to Iohn:* by the word, saith he, vnderstand thou the commandement of God, that thou mayst learne that he did not rashly, without vocation, intrude him selfe to giue testimonie of

Christ sent Ioan. 8. 12. Christ, but moued by the diuine Spirit and commandement of God.

3. Yea Christ him selfe would not vndertake the office & function of a Mes-

of a Meſsias,& Mediator,before he vvas ſent by his Father: *For I*, ſaith he, *came not of myſelfe but he ſent me*, and therfore he ſaith his doctrine is not his ovvne,but his Fathers,becauſe although he preached the ſame, yet for that he preached it in his Fathers name vvho ſent him, he calleth it his Fathers doctrine. And as Chriſt was ſent from his Father,ſo were his Apoſtles from him, elſe had not their name agreed to their perſon,becauſe the word Apoſtle cometh of the greek word ἀπόστολος which ſignifieth a meſſenger or Ambaſſador. And if they had not bene ſent,they could not haue preached, becauſe as faith and religion is reuealed only by God, ſo none can haue authoritie to preache it but frō God, according to that of S. Paul: *hovv ſhal they preach vnles they be ſent.*

Ioa. 7.
Aug. trac. 29
The Apoſtles ſent.
Ioa. 20.
Matt. 16.
Rom. 10.

4. And as it is proper to al true Apoſtles, not to preſume to preach before they be ſent, ſo is it as common to al falſe Prophetes to runne before they be ſent, and to preach their owne fancies vithout miſſion, or commiſsion: vvho therfore in diuers places of Scripture are ſaid to come, but neuer to be ſent. *Al they* (ſaith Chriſt) *vvho came before me are theeues and robbers.* Where you muſt note that he ſaith not, al they vvho vvere ſent, becauſe Moyſes and the Prophetes vvere ſent before him, and yet vvere neither theeues nor robbers,but he ſayth, *al they that came before me, are theeues and robbers*, that is vvho came of their ovvne leades neither ſent nor commanded, becauſe they ſtole authoritie from God, and arrogated that vnto them ſelues,which he neuer gaue them, vſing and abuſing his name,& crying that the Lord ſaith ſo, whem he neuer ſayed ſo, nor ment ſo. Which kinde of theefe is ſpecially noted with this marke of comming. *A thefe doth not come but to ſteale and kil.* The like maner of ſpeach vſeth S. Paul, ſaying: *If he that cometh ſhal preach vnto you any other Chriſt.* To be briefe he that can not lye, becauſe he is the prime and firſt veritie, and vvil not lye, becauſe he is goodnes it ſelfe, giueth vs this marke to knovv a falſe Prophet by: *Bevvare* (ſayth he) *of falſe Prophets.* But vvhat marke doeſt thou giue vs, ô Lord, to knovv them by, that vve may take hede of them? *VVho come*, ſayth he, *vnto you in the garmentes of sheepe, but invvardly are rauening vvolues.* Therfore God by Hieremie complaineth, that the falſe Prophets ran before he ſent them, preached before he ſpake vnto them, and deuiſed lyes of their ovvne inuentions. So that if any preachers come only, that is, come vnſent, they are theeues, that ſteale authoritie which vvas neuer giuen them, and they are falſe Prophets, vvhich runne on their ovvne heades before they be ſent, and preach their ovvne deuiſes, before they haue commiſsion.

Aug. tra. 45. in Ioan.
Maldonatus in Io. c. 10.
Ioa. 10.
2. Cor. 11.
Mat. 7.
Hier. c. 13. & 24

The newe preachers must shewe their mission.

5. If then our new reformers and Prophetes of the Lord (as they cal them selues) be sent from God (as they say they be) to reforme the Church not only in maners, but also in faith & religion, let them tel vs their mission, & shew vs their commission, & we wil reuerence them as the messengers, and respect them as the Ambassadors and Angels of God. But if they come on their owne heades, or can not giue vs assurance that they are sent from God, they must pardon vs, if we giue not eare vnto them: for if they be not sent, they haue no authoritie to deale with vs, and if they can not proue their mission, we haue no warrant to deale with them.

Else they are not to be credited.

The reason.

Missions ordinarie, extraordinarie.

6. Two maner of missions, which God vseth in sending preachers vnto vs, I find in holy writte, which also haue bene practised in the Church of God, the one ordinarie, the other extraordinarie. The extraordinarie mission is made immediatly from God, the ordinarie mission God maketh by meanes of some other, whom he hath sent immediatly from him selfe. For as God ordinarily doth nothing immediatly by him selfe, but by meanes of second causes, causing light by the Sunne, and heate by the fire, producing fruites by trees, and men and beastes by some of their owne kinde: yet he doth not so tye him selfe vnto his creatures, but that some times extraordinarily he worketh by him selfe, without any concurrence of them: as he did when with a word, or touch, he restored health, which ordinarily he doth by phisitions, and second causes: so likwise ordinarily God sendeth Pastors and preachers, and giueth them authoritie by others, yet somtimes also extraordinarily he sendeth them immediatly from him selfe.

Examples
1. Tim. 4.
2. Tim. 13.
Act. 6. 1. 4.

7. As for example: Moyses and Aaron in the old, law were sent immediatly from God, to recal his people out of Ægipt, and to rule and gouerne them in matters of religion, but the high Priestes which succeded Aaron, and were consecrated by him, and his successors, were sent by an ordinarie mission. In like maner in the new law, S. Peter and the rest of the Apostles were called and sent extraordinarily & immediatly from Christ: but they which succeeded the Apostles, and were ordained by them by imposition of handes & other ceremonies, were sent by an ordinarie mission, because our Saviour Christ when he instituted his Apostles, did also appoint a continual order, by which orthers should succede them in their offices, which was imposition of handes, by a Bishop lawfully consecrated: and so the Bishops which now are, may truly affirme that they are sent from Christ to rule & gouerne his Chuch, because they are cõsecrated & instituted, by the order

Imposition of handes.

χειροτονία.

Hier. in c. 58. Isaia.

which

which Christ hath appointed, and they succede the Apostles, whom Christ immediatly sent to preach, teach, and minister Sacramentes.

8. Now betwixt these two missions, this amongst others, is one difference: that an extraordinarie mission must be proued by miracles, or plaine prophecies, els euerie one may bragge that he is sent extraordinarily, and no man shal controle him: but an ordinarie mission needeth no such proofe: and therfore he vvho is sent by an ordinarie mission, if he can shew that he was instituted, by the ordinarie meanes which Christ hath left in his Church, & that he succeedeth them, who were counted lawful Pastors and preachers, he giueth sufficient testimonie of his ordinarie mission, and commission.

Extraordinarie missiõ proued by miracles.

Ordinarie proued by succession.

9. If then our new preachers be sent by an ordinarie mission, let them shew their succession, and tel vs the pedegree of their predecessors, that vve may see who were Bishops before them, and who consecrated and instituted them, and who gaue them commission and authoritie, to entermeddle in the rule and gouernemẽt of the Church. For so Christ ordinarily sendeth preachers and Pastors to his Church. Thus Tertullian vrged the heretikes of his time. *Let them*, saith he, *shevv vs the origin of their Churches, let them vnfolde the order of their Bishopes, vvhich by successors, so runneth on from the beginning, that the first Bishop haue for his author and predecessor some one of the Apostles or apostolical men, vvhich lined in the Apostles time, &c. As the Church of the Smyrneans doth register Polycarpe placed by S. Iohn, as the Church of the Romaines hath Clemẽt ordained by S. Peter. &c.* To this proofe S. Austin putteth the heretikes of his age: *Number*, saith he, *the prieſtes, euen from Peters seate, and looke vvhich to vvhich succeeded in the order of those Fathers.* And in an other place he saith, that this succession of Priestes, is the thing *vvhich holdeth him in the Catholique Church*: because he knew, that there is the true Church, where is the true religion, there true religion, where true Pastors to teach it, and there true Pastors, where one succedeth to an other by an ordinarie succession. Wherfore S. Ciprian by this succesion excludeth Nouatian, for, saith he, *Cornelius succeding immediatly to Fabianus Pope, and possessing the place of Peter, there is no place for Nouatianus.* And in an other place he maketh the like argument: *Ecclesia*, saith he, *si apud Nouatianum est, apud Cornelium non fuit, si verò apud Cornelium fuit, qui Fabiano Episcopo legitima ordinatione succeſsit, & quem, preter Sacerdotij honorem, martyrio quoque Dominus glorificauit, Nouatianus in Ecclesia non est, nec Episcopus computari potest, qui Euangelica & Apostolica traditione contempta, nemini succedens, a seipso ortus est.* If the Church be vvith Nouatian, it was not vvith Cornelius, but if it vvas

lib prescr. c. 32.

Psal. con. part Don. tom. 7. lib. cont. ep. fundamenti.

Ep. ad Antonianum de Cornel and Nouat.

l. 1. ep. 6. ad Magnum seu ep. 77.

with Cornelius, who ſucceded by lawful ordination to Fabian the Biſhop, and whom our Lord beſides the honour of Prieſthood, glorified with Martyrdom. Nouatian is not in the Church, neither can he be counted a Biſhop, who contemning the Euangelical and Apoſtolical Tradition, ſucceeding to none, began of him ſelfe. And ſo we muſt vrge our new reformers, to declare vnto vs the pedegrees of their anceſters, and to ſhevv vvho be the predeceſſors, to whom they be ſucceſſors, if they wil haue vs to admit them, as the miniſters of God, ſent by an ordinarie miſſion. But this they can neuer do: for who, I pray you, was the immediate predeceſſor of Luther and Caluin? or who he that made the firſt Superintendent in England? I am ſure and al the world, yea they them ſelues, wil witneſſe, that they are no ſucceſſors to the Catholique Biſhopes and Paſtors, becauſe they degenerate from them altogether, and they were faine to contemne and diſobey them, before they could open their mouthes in pulpites. Yea our Paſtors were ſo farre from ordaining them, or inſtituting them, & giuing them authoritie, that they cried out againſt them, as new ſtartuppes, and condemned them for heretikes, Antipaſtors, and new yea falſe Apoſtles. Neither can they deriue them ſelues from any other lawful paſtors: for before they them ſelues tooke vpon them the name and office of Paſtors, there were none at the time of their riſing, but our Catholique Paſtors. Yea as in the next booke is proued, they can not deriue their deſcent from ancient heretikes, becauſe in al pointes they agree not with any of them: and if they could, yet were not that ſufficient, for they were counted and condemned for arrant heretikes, vvho intruded them ſelues as theſe men do, into the true Paſtors offices, and were them ſelues as theſe men are, the firſt of their families, ſucceding to no predeceſſors. They wil ſay peraduenture that their firſt Biſhops, Prieſts, and preachers, were ordained by ours, before they departed from vs, and that they ordaining others, ſtil continued the ſucceſſion. But this euaſion is not ſufficient. For firſt of al, either our Paſtors were lawful or vnlawful; if lawful, then are theyrs vnlavvful, who preached againſt the commandement of ours, yea then are they vſurpers who thruſt out their lawful Paſtors, and ſetled them ſelues in their roomes. If vnlawful, then do they abſurdly chalenge ſucceſſion from them: becauſe none can ſuccede lavvfully to vnlawful predeceſſors, if they haue no other title but from them. Secondly although ſome of their Apoſtates were made Prieſtes and Paſtors by our Biſhops: yet al were not ſuch, Luther and Caluin the firſt founders and

The newv preachers are not ſent ordinarily.

ders and many others were no Bishops, and so could not ordaine Priestes and Pastors, and they which were true Bishops amongst them, vsed not the matter and forme of ordination, but only by a letter of the Prince, Superintendent or magistrate, constituted their inferior ministers, with as litle solemnitie as they make their Aldermen yea Constables, and Cryers of the market. And if they had truly ordained their ministers, as their Apostat Bishops might haue done if they had vsed the forme and matter of order, because power of consecrating and ordering, which diuines cal *Potestas ordinis* is neuer abolished, yet besides order, Iurisdiction and mission from a lawful Pastor is also required, for, as S. Paul sayth, *Quomodo prædicabunt nisi mittantur? hovv shal they preach vnles they be sent?* And seing that our Pastors were so farre from sending thē, that they forbad them al pulpits & preaching, from them they could not haue their mission: and so they can not prooue their ordinarie mission. To say as Luther and Brentius did, that it is sufficient to approue their mission, that they haue commission from the Prince or Magistrate, is to confound Priestes and Princes, magistrates and ministers, yea the Church and common welth: because if they may make ministers and giue authoritie to preach, then them selues may play the partes of ministers. And although we read that by Apostles and Bishops, and by imposition of their hands, Pastors and preachers haue bene appaointed, yet neuer was there any such authoritie giuen to Princes or magistrates, and neuer was there any such practise vnlesse it were amongst heretikes as it was in Tertulian. Yea in the old testament Amarias the high Priest menaged matters of religion, and Zabadias medled only with vvarre: and Ozias vvas stricken vvith a Leprosie for vndertaking priestly function: and in the new law of grace, Christ commended his Church to S. Peter and the Apostles, but neuer to Princes and to Magistrats at vnto Superiors, but only as vnto defenders, fauourers, and fosterfathers.

Rom. 10. Com. Ep. ad Gal. Ex Hosio li. cont. Brent. Act 13. 14. Tit. 1. & 1. Tim. 4. 2. Tim. 1. l. prosc. c. 41. 2. Par. 19. & 26.

10 Here they find them selues much pressed, and knovv not, I dare say, vvhat to answere: but they vvil play smale play rather then sit out, and vvil make hard shift rather then no shift, and shape a misshapen answer rather then no answere. And vvhat is that? they say that the Apostles vvhich were the first Bishops & Pastors, had for the tyme their lawful successors, but at the length the Church failed and the Pastors vvith it, and vvith them the succession decaied: but afterward Luther and Caluin reuiued this dead Church againe, and restored the Pastors: And so, say they, vve succede the Apostles and their immeditate

Ioan. 20. 21. Act. 14. Ephes. 4. Mat. vlt. Isa. 49. The reformers answver that the Church fel &c.

successors

succeſſors, but by interruption of manie hundred yeares.

A poore anſvver.

11. But this God knoweth is a poore ſhift, and a ſtale ſhift. For this was the anſwer of the heretikes in Tertulians time, againſt whom he vſeth no other argument then the abſurditie which foloweth ſo abſurde an anſwere. Then (ſaith he) truth which was impriſoned, expected Marcionites her redemers, and in the meane time Paſtors preached falſly, and the Chriſtians beleued erroniouſly, manie thouſandes were wrongly baptized, ſo manie workes of faith miniſtred amiſſe, ſo manie Chriſmes were euil wrought, ſo manie Preiſthoodes & miniſteries not rightly done, ſo manie martyrdomes al in vaine. The like may be ſaid againſt Luther, Zuinglius, Caluine, & other new Apoſtles of this time. Is the Church failed before your comming? then ſhe expected manie hūdred yeares for you in particular, then al miniſterie in the Church was al this while vvrong, preaching and teaching vvas falſe, they vvho boare the name of true Paſtors vvere not ſo, that ſocietie which was diſperſed throughout the world, & was counted the only Chriſtian Church, and was perſecuted for the ſame by the diuel & his miniſters, was a ſynagogue of the diuel, eſtabliſhed & vpholden by the diuel, and ſo one diuel perſecuted an other: al martyrdomes in that Church were in vaine, al actes of religion were ſuperſtitious, al Councels vvhich vvere gathered in this Church, al Paſtors that ruled in it, al Doctors that wrote and taught in it and for it, deceiued, and were deceiued. Happie then vvas the day in vvhich Luther leaped out of his Monaſterie, diſobeied the Pope & Church: & hauing gotten a yoke felovv, out of a cloyſter of profeſſed & vowed virgins, deuiſed a new religion, to cloake his villanie. And could not Chriſt al that while, find out a man fit to reſtore his Church from death to life: was there no *Ambroſe*, no *Auſtin*, no *Hierome*, no *Gregorie* fit for ſuch a purpoſe? and vvas Luther the onlie man, vvho for learning and vertue (though he vvere an apoſtata) vvas according to God his hart and liking, whom God vviſhed for, and expected ſo long? Tertulian thinketh it as abſurd to ſay, that Chriſt ſent new Apoſtles, as that he was borne againe, and deſcended againe from heauen, dyed, and roſe againe, becauſe (ſayth he) theſe two go together. And therfore to ſay, that the Church fel and vvas again reſtored by nevv Apoſtles, is to ſay, that Chriſt is again deſcended, and dyed, and roſe again to ſend vs new Apoſtles. But if I demonſtrate that the true Church can not die, not euer decay, then is their Church a baſtard ſynagogue, which, as they ſay, once floriſhing in the Apoſtles time, & a ſmale time after, then died for no litle time, but

Tert. li. 1. Preſcr. c. 29.

The abſurditie vvhich folovveth an abſurde anſvver.

lib. preſcr.

The nevv Church is a baſtard Church.

for

for some hundredes of yeares: or elſe they muſt of neceſsitie ſhew a ſucceſsion of their church and Religion, from age to age, and of their paſtours, from paſtour to paſtour: and if they can not, they are not ſent by an ordinarie miſsion, becauſe they ſucced to no predeceſſours, but are the firſt of their familie. This I haue demonſtrated in the ſecond booke, as the reader may ſee, if he pleaſe to turne ouer a few leaues, & ſo here I may ſuppoſe it, and ſuppoſing conclude, that they are not ſent by an ordinarie miſsion, becauſe they ſucced to none.

That the church cã not faile, is proued in the next booke chap. 5.

Another anſwer for their ordinarie miſsion, to wit, that they had a ſucceſsion of Paſtours inuiſible. chap. 5.

12. But if this anſwer wil not ſerue (as a blind man may ſee that it doth not) then they haue an other in ſtore: and what is that? they ſay forſooth, that they are true ſucceſſours to the Apoſtles, and that they haue their predeceſſours vvho beleeued as they do, ruled the Church, miniſtred & receaued Sacrements, but ſecretly, and inuiſibly, becauſe their church it ſelfe, was al that time inuiſible. And ſo if you demaund of them, who were their predeceſſours? they wil anſwer, that they had predeceſſours, but they were inuiſible. This is an other blind ſhift of theirs, which I ſhal refute in the next booke at large. Here only I demaund, whether this inuiſible Church was inuiſible to them ſelues, or to papiſtes only and painimes, who were not of their religion? If it were inuiſible to them ſelues, how can they tel that there was anie religion, like to theirs before their time, or that there were anie paſtours of their kinde? for that which was inuiſible vnto them, could not be ſeene of them, & ſo we are no more to beleeue them, in ſaying that they had a Church and paſtours before Luthers tyme, then a blynde man that wil determine of coulours. If they ſay it was inuiſible only to papiſtes and paganes, and others which were not of their Church: then as it is like, Luther and Caluin who were members of that Church, knew wel the paſtours to whom they ſucceeded, and of whom they receaued authoritie. Let them tel vs then who they were, elſe we can not receaue them as miniſters of God ſent by on ordinarie miſſion, becauſe they can not ſhew vs their predeceſſours, to whom they ſucceeded. Thus I haue plainlie proued that theſe men are not ſent by an ordinarie miſſion, becauſe they ſucceed to none who were their predeceſſours. What now can they ſaie why we ſhould not reiect them as falſe prophetes, who run before they be ſent, and preach before they be called to that function?

The refutation of it.

13 They wil ſay, as often tymes they do, that they were ſent immediatly from Chriſt, by an extraordinarie miſſion. But then we muſt put them alſo to the proofe of this their miſſiõ. And firſt of al in ſaying

An other anſwer.

Christ sẽdeth no preachers but by succession.

that they are sent extraordinarilie, they bewraie them selues to be those Apostles which runne vnsent, because it is manifest in scripture, that Christ appointing Apostles, ordained a succession of pastours to the end. For as he instituted a visible Church, which is neuer to faile or falle (as shal be in the next booke demonstrated) so did he appoint perpetual gouernours and pastours to gouerne & rule this Church in a visible manner, as there also shal be proued: else should that visible and goodlie mystical bodie of Christ, haue bene left headlesse with out a visible head: and because the same pastours could not alwaies liue to gouerne the Church visiblie, it followeth that Christ instituted a succession of them, and consequently that Christ sendeth none to rule in his Church, but by succession to some others, by whom they were ordained and instituted: and therfore he that enters into the gouernement of the Church and not by this entrie, and dore of succession, he is a theefe that seeketh windowes, corners, & bywaies, as them selues do, who because they meane no good, dare not enter into the house, as honest men do, by the ordinarie waie. Let not then the reformers brag of their extraordinarie mission, because Christ hauing instituded a perpetual succession of ordinarie pastours, meaneth not to send any extraordinarie preachers, rather they maie be ashamed of their monstrouse natiuities: for they are like vnto those heretikes of whom Optatus speaketh *Qui de se nasci voluerunt*: *Which vvould be borne of them selues.* They are like to Victor the Donatist, who as Optatus affirmeth, was a sonne without a father, and a disciple without a maister. They are not vnlike Nouatian, who as S. Cipriane auerreth *Nemini succedens, à seipso ortus est. Succeding to no man, began of him selfe.*

He is a theefe that ẽters not by succession.

The mõstrous birthes of the newu preachers.

l. 1. cont. Par.

l. 2. cont. Par.

l. 1. ep. 6.

Ephes. 4.

14. But let vs giue them leaue to saie at least that they vvere sent extraordinairilie, that so we maie see better how they can proue their extraordinarie mission, and how we can disproue the same. First I demaund of them vvhere they read in scriptures that after Christ had established a succession of pastours to gouerne his Church to the end, he vvould send somtymes extraordinarie ministers, to put them out of office, & to enter into the gouerment of the Church to reforme al absurde abuses? for if they can not bring scripture for this, they are not to be credited, & that by their ovvne confession. But I knowe they can not alleage any one lyne of scripture for that purpose, and I am sure, & they are not ignorant, that Christ sayd he builded his Church vpon a rocke so that it should not neede the repairing of these new masons, & established a kingdom, & consequently gouernours, which

No scripture foretelleth extraordinarie preachers.

Mat. 16.

The Constancie of the church.

vvhich shoulde continew for euer, and so shoulde neede no innouation: vvhich point here after shal be more amplie proued. *Dan. 2. Second booke chap. 5.*

15. But suppose that our sauiour had foretolde the fal, & ruine of his Church & ordinarie pastours, & had fore vvarned vs of new Apostles & pastours to be sent to make a reformation: yet seeing that God hath also vvarned vs of false prophetes, vvho vvil falselie prophecie in his name, whereas he sent them not, & who shal deuine & foretel lyes and vanities, saying that the lord sayd so, and seeing that the Apostle commaundeth vs verie straitly to take heede of false prophetes, which come in sheepes fleeces, yea in coates of true pastours, bearing the name of pastours, & alleaging scriptures for a cloke to their heresies, as true pastours do for their true doctrine; yea sithence that Christ himselfe biddeth vs to beware of false prophetes, who come in the garmentes of innocent sheepe, but inwardlie are rauening wolues: that is (as Vincentius Lyrinensis expounderh) who inuest them selues in the goodlie garmentes of the Prophetes and Apostles testimonies, but inwardly, if you vnmaske them by expounding the testimonies which they alleage, you shal espie rauening vvolues vnder sheepes & sheepeherdes coates, and byting, yea deuouring heresies, couered verie cominglie vvith the sayinges of the Prophetes & Apostles: seing that I say we haue such warning of false prophetes, vve haue good reason to suspect these reformers for such kinde of cattle, & vve haue no reason to harken vnto them as vnto true prophetes, vnles they can proue their extraordinarie mission, by extraordinarie signes & tokens of prophecies, or miracles, & so can giue vs a note to distinguish them from the false prophetes, vvhose comming is so often and so plainlie foretolde. Otherwise if it be sufficiēt that they can say the are sent extraordinarilie, then do we open the gappe to false prophtes, who when they come, wil not let to say, yea and to sweare as much, and so they can not be excluded if these men be admitted. Yea we make God most vnreasonable, to thinke that he wil send extraordinarie messengers & yet giue them no letters of credit, nor extraordinary signes or tokens of their embassie. For in so doing he should ether cause them to rōne on a sleeules arrande, or else he should bynd vs to giue eare vnto them who can proue their commission no better, then false prophetes can, of whom not withstanding he commandeth vs to beware. *l cont prophanas hæresum nouitates c.37* *Good reason to suspect the newv preachers for false prophets.*

16. This Moyses wel perceauing, vvould not take vpon him that great Embassage, vntil that God had promised him the guift of vvorking miracles, by which he might proue his mission. *Non credent mihi* (saith *Exod. 4.*

Moyses miſſion proued by miracles.

(ſaith he) *neque audient vocem meam, ſed dicent non apparuit tibi Dominus: They vvil not beleue me, nor giue eare vnto my voice, but vvil ſay, God did not appeare vnto thee.* As if he had ſaid: thou ſaieſt, o lord, that thou meaneſt to ſend me into Ægipt, vnto the tyrant Pharao, to deliuer thy people from his tyrannie, but how ſhal I make it knowne ether vnto him, or vnto thy people, that thou in deede doſt ſend me? my bare word wil not be taken, becauſe they vvil ſay I am a ſtranger vnto them, & for any thing vvhich they know, may come as vvel in my owne name, yea in the deuils name, as God his name. This ſeemed to God ſo reaſonable an excuſe, that he gaue him by & by the guift of vvorking miracles, by vvhich he might proue his extraordinarie miſſion. For he ſaid vnto Moyſes, *Vvhat is that vvhich thou hast in thy hand?* Moyſes anſwered, *a rodde*: and God ſaid, caſt it on the ground: and it vvas tourned into a ſerpent. And this ſaith God I do that they may beleeue that I appeared vnto thee. Wherfore when after his coming into Ægipt, he had vvrought ſo ſtraung miracles, & admirable vvorkes, the Iſraelites beleeued that he vvas ſent to deliuer them, & accordingly they followed him, though Pharaos hart vvas ſo obdured, that al thoſe miracles could nether breake, nor mollifie it, he by his free vvil reſiſting gods graces, & forcible callinges

The reaſon.

Vvhy made not Luther the ſame excuſe?

Exod. 4.

Mal. 3. Mar. 1. Luc. 1. Saint Ihon Baptiſts miſſion is proued by extraordinarie ſignes.

17 In like maner, S. Ihon Baptiſtes miſsion, vvas proued not only by the prophecie of Malachie, but alſo by his miraculous natiuitie, & the teſtimonie of an Angel; although he came not to preach any new doctrine, but only to exhort the people to penance, vvhich before by other prophetes had beene inculcated: and to poynt out the Meſsias vvith his finger, vvhom al the prophetes had fortould ſo plainlie, that when Chriſt appeared, it was almoſt euident, that he vvas the man on vvhom had ronne ſo longe a beadrolle of prophecies and predictions.

Chriſte proueth his miſſion by miracles.

Io. 7. 9. 10. 11.

The Meſſias alſo him ſelfe Chriſt IESVS, becauſe he ſucceeded to none, but came vvith extraordinairie autoritie, ſent immediatly from his father, proued his miſsion by ſo manifeſt workes & miracles, that he ſaid his workes did teſtifie, from whom he was ſent, and the people alſo confeſſed that he could not haue wrought ſuch wonders, if he had not beene of God. And although Chriſt had ſufficiently by miracles and prophecies, which ranne of him, proued that he was the Meſſias: Yet he thought not that ſufficient for the proofe of the miſsion of his Apoſtles, but becauſe they were ſent immediatly from him, and were ſucceſſours to none (for to Chriſt they were only vicegerentes) he gaue them alſo power to worke miracles, by which they

So do the Apoſtles.

might

might proue their mission and *confirme their doctrine vvith signes that followed.* Now then if our ghospel-spillers be sent by an extraordinarie mission, immediatly from God, let them shew vs some miracles for proofe of their extraordinarie commission, or else were we more thē madde to credit them, being forewarned that false prophetes shal come, from whom these men can not distinguish them selues, vnlesse they can shew vs some manifest prophecies, or worke some wonders amongst vs. To say that they preach nothing but the word of God, and that the spirit inwardly hath moued & excited them to preach, is not sufficient, because that is to make bare scripture and the priuat spirit vmpiers in religion, which in the two next chapters is refuted, & to say so, is to say no more then al heretikes may say, & so, if for so saying, without any miracles, vve admit their preaching, we can exclude no false prophets.

Math. 26.

The nevv preachers are vrged to shevv their miracles.

18. Let Luther then the first man of this new familie, vvho as he & his say, is sent by God extraordinarilie, to reforme the Christian world, & to make vs new-no christians, let him, I say, shew his miracles, if he wil haue any audience: for else vve may iustly feare least he be one of those false prophetes, of whom before hand God hath warned vs. In deed, I graunt, that he on atime, to shew him selfe a true prophet, auouched verie boldy that after two yeares preaching, he would be the death of al Popes, and would banish Cardinalls, Monkes, Nunnes, masses, and bells out of the christian world. But Luther is gone long since, and yet Popes raigne, Cardinalls flourish, Monkes and Nunnes possesse their olde monasteries, sauing in England, and some few other corners: masses also are not only said but sounge solemnlie, and bells do ringe stil, and the world doth ring of bells. He caused also to be engrauen vppon his tombe this verse in Latine *Pestis eram viuens, moriens, ero mors tua, Papa.*

VVilest here I liued, I vvas thy plague, and dying (Pope) Ile be thy death.

But yet Popes liue, and may treade vppon Luthers graue, stil Popes raigne, & thoughe they be excluded from England, Germanie, Scotland, and some few other places, yet do they exercise their authoritie stil, and as much as euer, in Italie, Spayne, France and other countryes, and haue by the Benedictins, Dominicanes, Iesuites, Augustines, and Franciscanes meanes, andindustrious laboures, extended their iurisdiction to the Indies and other new found landes and countreys. Likewise the same Luther in his railing booke against king Henry the eight thus againe prophecieth: *Dogmata mea stabūt & Papa cadet:*

Luthers vaine prophecie. So Cocleus vvrites. also Lindan in his dialogue, & Surius An. 1538.

Surius Ann. 1546. & Lindanus sup.

Lopes l. 1. c. 2. Gen. l. 4 cron. anno Christi 1492 Gōzal. 2. p. hist. de la Chine c. 24. l. 3. hist. gen. c. 28.

l. cont. Regem Angl.

cadet: Viderit Deus, vter primo fessus defecerit, Papa, an Lutherus. My opinions (saith he) *shal stand, and the Pope shal falle, let God looke to it, whether the Pope wearied out, or Luther shall first fayle.* And yet we see that Popes liue and raigne, & Luther is dead & descended to hel, and his doctrine decaieth more and more, and many are now wearie of it, and see more and more into his absurdities. On a tyme also this man of God, this great Patriarche and fift Euangelist, this second Elias, and eight wise man, to get him selfe a name, assaied what he could do, in dispossessing of a deuil, but it would not be, & the reason I thinke was, because one deuil will not, or can not, cast out an other: yea the deuil so scarred Luther for attempting so great a matter, that the dores being shut by the deuil, the man of God was fayne to breake the windowes least the deuil should teare him in peeces. But peraduenture he will bragge of his natiuitie. In deede that was straunge, for although he was not borne by miracle, as S. Ihon Baptist was, yet some are of opinion, that he is descended eyther by father or mother from the deuil him selfe, who was *incubus* to his mother, or *succubus* to his father.

An other of his proud and fonde propheeies.

His vaine attempt to cast out a deuil.

Staphilus Apol. 2 Genebr. chron. l. 4. an. Christ. 1556.

His euil successe.

His Natiuitie

Font. in trac. sacr. de statu rel.

Bolsec. c. 13.

19. Ihon Caluine also an other patriarch of the new Church, made the like attemptes, but they had the like successe. He agreed on a tyme, for a peece of money, with a man, to fayne him selfe first sicke, & after dead, and he coniured his wife to weepe and lament the death of her husband, that by her teares and lamentations, the iest might seeme more probable. The sicke man was cõmended at euerie preach, to be praied for, afterward the man fayned him selfe to be dead, his wife crieth out, Caluine goeth a walking with a great troupe, and passing by the sicke mans house, demaunded, as one altogeather ignorant of the matter, what was the cause of those cryes and lamentations, and answer being made that one was dead, he entreth in, falleth downe on his knees, praieth to God to shew his power, in raising the dead to life, and therin to glorifie his seruaunt Caluine, that the world might know, that he was the man, whom God had culled out to be the only man, who should reforme & repaire the Church of Christ. And hauing ended his praier, he takes the man by the hand & commaundes him in God his name to arise. But the man after much calling not arising, his wife calleth on him also, & rubbes him on the side, to signifie that now was the tyme to rise: but he nether could answere nor moue, but by God his iuste iudgment (who nether will nor can worke a miracle, to maintaine a falshoode) was stone-deade and as colde as claye: & so the ieste was tourned into good earnest, and

Caluins pretended miracle.

The successe of his miracle.

the com-

he comedie into a tragedie: vvhich his vvife perceauing, cried out on Caluin, & called him a coosening knaue, & murderer of her husband: but Caluine departeth vvith a flea in his eare, saying, 'that ouermuch greefe had opereſſed the vvife, & depriued her of her vvittes.

20. Wherfore since that the nouellers can vvorke no miracles, raise no dead men, dispossesse no deuills, foretel no future thinges, heale no diseased, not so much as a lame dogge, to proue their authoritie, what reason haue we to harken vnto them? And if we giue eare vnto them: who may not chalenge audience at our handes? For suppose some brainsicke Browniſt, some brother of the familie of loue, or some other, if it may be, more phantastical, should preach the dreames of his drowsie head, & vayne conceiptes of his idle brayne, calling them new points of religion, and reformations of the olde, might he not alleage some scripture for euery fancie of his, though neuer so vayne, & make a shew also of proofe, if he expoũd it as he please? might he not discanon bookes of scripture vvhich seeme to stand in his vvaie? and being demanded by vvhat autoritie he taketh al this vpon him, might he not say that he is sent from Christ immediatlie? And being further requested to shew some miracles, as extraordinarie signes to proue an extraordinarie mission, might he not easilie answer, and that out of scripture also, that miracles are for infidells, and that Luther & Caluin are accepted of, vvho neuer could so much as heale a halting dogge, and therfore that he & his preaching can not be refused, if they & theirs be admitted?

If the newe preachers be admitted vvithout miracles, no heretikes can be reiected

21. And so we see, that if we accept of the reformers of this time, as the true Apostles, ministers, & messengers of God, not vvithstanding that they can nether shew succession for their ordinary, nor miracles for their extraordinary mission, we open the gappe to al false Apostles, and heretikes whatsoeuer: the dore is open for them, they maie enter in thicke, and threefolde into the ministerie, and can not be excluded, if these new reformers be receaued, without playne and palpable partialitie. And so thou seest, gentle reader, that in England, & other places, where this new doctrine hath taken roote, they haue no probable assurance of their religion by the authoritie of their preachers, because they can say no more for proofe of their authoritie, then can the false Apostles.

22. Sithence therfore thou art warranted that the Church & succession of her pastours, shal neuer falle nor fayle, and art forewarned also, that false prophetes shal come and say they are sent, when God neuer

No false prophets can be reiected if the

newu preachers be admitted.

neuer sent them at al, how canst thou hang thy saluatiō, on these new ministers, whom thou canst not distinguish from false prophetes, because they can shew no more probabilitie of their ordinarie or extraordinarie mission, then they did, & to whom thou canst not giue care, but thou must harken also by the same reason vnto al false prophetes who can say as much for them selues as thy preachers can do, and therfore can not be reiected if these be receaued, with out playn partialitie.

The second chapter shewveth, howu the Reformers grounding their Religion on bare scripture, do set the gate open vnto al heretikes and heresies.

The deuil playes the Ape.

THE deuil hath alwaies played the ape, euen from the beginning: for after that he perceaued, that he could not be God in deede, to vvhich dignitie by climing thoughts he had ambitionsly aspired, he endeuoured by al meanes possible, so to bring his intentes to passe, that he might at least go for a God, & be taken for a God; and therfore like an ape he hath euer imitated God so neerly, that he would be honoured and serued in the same fashion and manner as he saw the true God vvas vvorshipped. God is serued vvith sacrifice as with a seruice dew vnto diuine Majestie, the deuil vvas euer honoured amongst the paganes vvith his Hecatombs, & Sacrifices, euen by the Emperours of the vvorld, God hath his priests, the deuil his flamins, God hath his Sacraments, the deuil his expiations, & ceremonies; God hath his Baptisme, his Eucharist, his Nonnes, & the deuil hath his washings, his oblation of bread, & his vestal virgins, & as God promiseth a heauen to his seruantes & vvorshippers, so doth the deuil promise his Elisian feelds, and threatneth his stigiane lake. And euen as the deuil by Idolatours hath imitated Gods sacrifice, sacramentes, and manner of vvorshippe, so by heretikes, he hath alwaies affected, to be as like as may be, to Christ and his Apostles, in citation and allegation of scripture. Vvherfore Vincentius Lyrinensis, noteth it to haue beene the practise of heretikes the mēbers of the deuil, to alleage scriptures against the true christian

Tert. l. presc. cap. 40.

Tert. ibid.

Heretikes are apes also.

l. cont. proph. c 37.

and

nd members of Christ, as once the deuil their head, against Christ IESVS our head, wrested a place of scripture, to proue that he must needs cast him selfe headlong from the pinnacle of the temple, to proue him selfe the sonne of God. *The customs of heretikes to alleage scripture. Mat. 6.*

2. Marcion (as Vvitnesseth Tertullian) to proue that the vvorld (which he imagined to be of an euil nature) vvas created of an euil God, vsed that place of Saint Matthew: *Non potest arbor bona malos fructus facere: A good tree can not bring forth euil fruites.* Valentinus, as the same autour relateth, to perswade the world, that Christs body was framed of the substance of the heauens, and consequently was no true flesh, nor truly conceaued and borne of the Virgin Marie, but rather passed through her wombe as through a pipe, taking no substaunce of her: alleaged S. Pauls wordes, who comparing the first Adam, from whom we fetch our carnal pedegree, with the second Adam Christ IESVS, from whom we are descended spiritually, vseth these words: *The first man of earth earthly, the second man from heauen heauenly*: Not knowing, or not willing to know, that Christ is called heauenly, ether in respect of his diuinitie and diuine person, or because he was not earthly, that is subiect to sinne, vvhich proceedeth from earthly and terrene desires, or because his body, by right, vvas from the first moment of his conception, celestial, that is glorious, as are the bodies of the blessed (which therfore saint Paul calleth also spiritual) and afterwarde was the first body that rose to that glorie to which it euer had good right, because a glorious soule, such as Christs was from the first infusion of it in to the body, required as dew a glorious body: but Christ would haue his body to want this dew, whilest he liued with vs, that he might suffer for vs, which he could not haue done in a glorified body. *So did Marcion. l. præsc. c. 51. Mat. 7. So did Valentinus. l. de carne Christi c. 20. 1. Cor. 15. How Christe is called heuenly. Ibidem.*

The Arians to proue God the Sonne, inferiour to his father, and not cōsubstantial, nor coæqual vnto him, brought his owne words against him: *the father is greater then I*: omitting many pregnant places which auouch the sonne to be consubstantial, and æqual vnto him, to which places, this also is not contrarie, because it proueth only that Christ as man, is inferiour to his father. The Nestorias by those places by which we proue two natures in Christ, the one humaine, the other diuine, proued two persons in Christ. The Eutichianes by the same places of scripture, by which Catholiques do proue that in Christ was but one person, endeuoured to proue that in Christ was but one nature. And it hath bene the propertie of al heretikes, to make no bones of scriptures, but prodigally to spend them, and to lauish them out, to proue *Io. 14. Augustl. 1. Trin. c. 7.*

Supra. therby their hereſies, were they neuer ſo phantaſtical. *Hic fortaſſe* (ſaith Vincentius Lyrinenſis) *aliquis interroget, an & hæretici diuinæ ſcripturæ teſtimonijs vtantur? Vtuntur plané & vehementer quidem, nam videas eos volare per ſingula quæque diuinæ legis volumina: Here perchaunce ſome vvil demaund vvhether that heretikes do vſe the teſtimonies of holy ſcripture? they vſe them aſſuredly and that vehemently, for you ſhal ſee them flye through euery volume of the beauenly lavv. Read* (ſayth he) *the vvorkes of Paulus Samoſatenus, of Priſcillianus, Iouinianus, or Eunomius, and thou ſhalt find an infinite heap of examples, almoſt no page omitted, vvhich is not dyed and coloured vvith ſentences of the olde & nevv Teſtamẽt. remember* (ſaith Hilarius) *that there is no heretike vvhich doth not fayn that his blaſphemies, vvhich he preacheth are according vnto Scriptures* And S Auſtine is of opinion, that hereſies proceede from no other fountaine, then ſcriptures wrongly expounded, and crookedly wreſted: *Non alunde natæ ſunt hæreſes, niſi dum ſcripturæ bonæ, intelliguntur non bene: From no other ſource hereſies do proceede, but vvhileſt good ſcriptures, are euilly vnderſtood.*

Orat. 2. cont. Conſt.

Tract. 18. in Ioa.

Heretikes haue no right to ſcriptures.

Catholiques are the true owners.

Their right and title is proued.

Second booke chap. 5.

2. But yet herein, theſe heretiques are liberal of that which is none of their owne, and like Æſops crow, they proudly decke them ſelues with other byrds fethers. For what right or title haue they to ſcriptures, of which they are ſo prodigal? or how came they to get the poſſeſſion of ſcriptures? truly as theeues take poſſeſſion of other mens goods. For Catholiques haue had the ſcriptures in their keeping tyme out of mynde, as al hiſtories, al councels, and ancient tradition, wil witneſſe for vs: and ſo at leaſt by preſcription, Catholiques are the true and lawful poſſeſſours of ſcripturs. Yea hiſtories, and the ancient bookes of the fathers, who from the firſt age alleaged ſcriptures, are arguments that we are the lawful heires to the Apoſtles, concerning the inheritaunce of ſcripture, becauſe as hereafter ſhal be proued, we only are ſucceſſours to the ancient fathers, and Apoſtles them ſelues. And ſeing that ſuch arguments would caſt them in law, if the controuerſie were but about a peece of ground, I ſee no reaſon, but that if the reformers of this tyme, and the Catholiques ſhould put this caſe to any indifferent iudge, to wit, whether they or Catholiques are the lawful poſſeſſours of ſcripture, the iudge muſt needes giue ſentence for the Catholique partie, which was the firſt poſſeſſour, and poſſeſſour, euen from the Apoſtles, of holy ſcripture. Yea the Reformers of this age, Luther, and Caluin, when they began to preach, receiued not the Bible of any of their prædeceſſours, becauſe before Luther, ther were no Lutherans, nether were there Caluiniſts before Caluine,

Caluine; but they found the Bible in the Catholique and Romain Church, which euer had the custodie of this treasure, and out of this Church they tooke the Bible, else had they neuer come to the knowledge of it: and seing that they tooke it, with out the lawful owners leaue, it must needs follow, that they are theeues, and no lawful possessours, and consequently, haue no right to vse it, especially against the right owner. Wherfore if they wil fight with vs, with no other weapons then scriptures, we must first put them to the proofe of their title, least we admit them to scriptures, who haue no right vnto them, and permit them to vse our owne weapon, to cut our owne throats. And seing that they cannot proue them selues lawful possessours of scripture, nether are we bound to dispute with them by scripture, nether haue they any right, or reason, to alleage scripture against vs. But yet at I haue declared, heretikes fingers itche, and are neuer wel but when they are singring of Scriptures, and their tongues are neuer so glibbe, as when they are sauced with textes of scripture.

Heretikes vse to alleage scriptures.

4 And why thinke you, do they so willingly alleage scripture, & decide al by the bare letter of scripture? Many reasons ther are why they do so. For first their guiltie conscience vrgeth them therevnto. For as the fowle and beautilesse mayde, perceuing her defect and vvante of natural beautie, is fayne to vse extrinsecal colours, to make shevv of beautie, vvher indeed is none; so the heretikes, ether doubting in conscience of the veritie of their opinions, or at least not able otherwise to defende them from errour, are constrained to vse scriptures, as colours, to make at least a show of veritie, where indeede no veritie is to be found. Fos as S. Ambrose sayth, impietie seeing authoritie to be esteemed: couereth her selfe with the veale of scripture: that vvheras by her selfe she is not acceptable, by scripture she may seeme most commendable. Wherfore Vincentius Lyrinensis sayeth, that heretikes herein are like to sluttes, vvho perfume vvith sweete odours & pouders, those things vvhich of them selues are stinking, or to those nurses who anointe the cuppe brimmes with hony, to make heedles children to drinke down the bitter potion: or to those Apothecaries, who vppon the boxes, vvhich conteine poison, vvrite the names of soueraine restauratiues: for so heretikes vvith the sweet odours of scriptures, perfume the ordurs of their heresies, & vvith the svveet hony of Gods vvord, vvhich tasted to Dauid lik the hony combe, deceue the vnheedy and make them drinke poison in their golden cupps, & applying scripture to their poisonful doctrine, they

And vvhy.

The first reason.

Assimilitude

Amb. in c. vlt. ad Tit.

c. 36.

Heretikes fitly compared.

Psal. 118.

make the ſimple to buy of them deadly poiſon, in ſteed of holſome medecins, that is hereſies, in ſteed of true faith and religion.

It is not enough to alleage the letter of ſcripture.
The deuil did ſo.
Mat. 4.
Li. præſcrip. c. 19.
Tertulian refuſeth to diſpute by the bare letter.
His reaſon.
Caſtro v. Scriptura.
Sixtus l. 7. 8. Bibl.

5. Let not then our Reformers bragge ſo much of ſcripture, nether let them thinke to cary away the bucklers, becauſe they alleage ſcripture for euery thing, and let not the ſimple people thinke them ſelues ſecure, becauſe their miniſter proueth vvhat he preacheth by ſcripture, becauſe euery heretike doth the ſame, & the deuil him ſelfe hath alleaged ſcripture, and vvould haue proued, that Chriſt muſt caſt him ſelfe headlong from the pinnacle, if he might haue had that libertie, which al heretikes do take, that is to expoũd ſcripture as he pleaſeth Vvherfore Tertulian refuſeth flatly, to diſpute with heretikes by bare ſcripture, and countes it but lippe-labour. And good reaſon had he, becauſe ether they wil deny ſcripture, when they can not drawe it to their byas, or they wil expound it as they liſt, if it may abide gloſſing, and ſo they ſhape not their doctrine according to ſcripture, but rather ſcripture according to their doctrine. and ſo they are like to that Tyrant, who ſtretched forth thẽ that were to ſhort for his iron bed, ant cut them ſhorter, that were to longe: framing them, according to his bed, not his bed according to them. Yea it is ſo vſuall thing amongſt them, to diſcanon bookes of ſcripture, or to diſmember and mayme them, if they ſtand in their way, that ther is almoſt no part of ſcripture, which by one heretike or other, hath not been reiected or mangled.

Vvhy Marciõ vvas called the mouſe of Pontus.
Li. 1. contra Marcionem. Tert. l. præſer. c. 51.
Iren. l. 1. c. 8.
Epiph. her. 30.
Prefat. in Euang. Cocl. in vita.
l. de operibus c. 14.

6. Marcion was ſo coning in this point, that Tertulian calleth him *mus Ponticus, the mouſe of Põtus*, for gnawing of ſcriptures. Cerdon denyed S. Matthewes Ghoſpel, becauſe it ſettes dovvne the genealogie of Chriſt, vvhich could not ſtand vvith his hereſie, that avouched that Chriſt had no true fleſh, and that he vvas not truly borne. The Ebionits refuſed ſaint Pauls Epiſtles, becauſe they reiect the Iewiſh ceremonies, vvhich thoſe heretikes allovved of. And vvhy did Martin Luther the Archeretike of this age, diſallovv of S. Iames Epiſtle, but becauſe it is ſo oppoſit to his ſolafidian iuſtice? other vviſe vvhat more certaintie hath he of S. Pauls Epiſtles, then of that of S. Iames, eſpecially he hauing no knovvledge nether of the one nor the other, but by the Romain and Catholique church, vvhich eſteemeth of both alike: S. Auſtin vvas ſo far from doubting of the veritie of this Epiſtle of S. Iames, that he affirmeth it to haue beene vvritten of purpoſe against certain heretikes, vvho miſconſtred S. Pauls Epiſtles as Luther and Caluin do. Vvhy doth Luther diſcanon Iob? Vvhy ieſteth he at

Eccle-

Ecclesiastes? Vvhy contemneth he al the gloſpells but Saint Ihons, the epiſtle to the Hebrewes, and that of Iudas? Vvhy doth not Caluin like of Ecclesiasticus, Iudith, and the Machabees, but becauſe that theſe bookes are oppoſite to ſome point or other of their doctrine?

see the 8. booke chap. 4.

7 What merueil then, if we refuſe to decide controuerſies with them, by bare ſcripture, who if wee bring a place of ſcripture, againſt them, wil deny it to be ſcripture, though al the world ſay contrarie? And although they admit ſome bookes of ſcripture, yet thoſe they ſo admit, that they wil haue the bare letter, or ioined with their volũtarie expoſition, to be the iudge of controuerſies, that ſo they may make ſcriptures to ſpeake as they liſte, and to giue that ſentence which pleaſeth them: & this is an other reaſon, why they would haue the bare letter of ſcripture to be Iudge. For bare ſcripture is of a waxie nature, and is as plyable to admit diuers expoſitions, as waxe is to take diuers impreſſions. Which is the cauſe, why heretikes out of ſcripture ſo eaſilie can excogitate, and deuiſe euen contrarie hereſies. Luther therfore calleth ſcripture the booke of heretikes, an other compared ſcripture to Æſops fables, becauſe you may as diuerſly interpret ſcripture, as you may moralize thoſe fables. Others calle ſcripture a noſe of vvaxe, becauſe it may be wreſted and wried euery waye: which comparisons although they be odious, and litle beſeeming the maieſtie of ſcripture, yet are they true, if by ſcripture you vnderſtand the bare letter of ſcripture, without an aſſured interpretour, as the reformers do. For the bare letter of ſcripture, is ſo ambiguous, & may haue ſo many ſenſes and meanings, that it may be applyed to what you wil, and may be, and already hath bene vſed, for the proofe of the moſt abſurd hereſies that euer were.

The bare letter is pliable to many ſenſes.

Ex Hoſio li. 3 contra Brent.

Ex Alano copo dial. 6. c. 9.

Some call ſcripture a noſe of vvaxe.

8 But whileſt they alleage the bare letter of ſcripture for confirmation of their doctrine, wel may they ſo delude the vnlerned, but men of learning and intelligence, are wel aſſured, that the bare letter is no more ſcripture, then the body of a man is a man. For as the ſoule is the life of the body, and that which maketh a man: ſo the ſenſe is the life of the word, and that which giueth ſcripture life, eſſence, and being. Wherfore ſainct Hierom ſayth, that *The ghoſpel is not in the vvord but in the ſenſe, not in the barke, but in the ſappe, not in the leaues of the vvords, but in the roote of the meaning.* Let not therfore our reformers vaunt in their pulpits, that they trye their doctrine by the touchſtone of ſcripture, nether let them inſult ouer Catholiques, as though they relyed only on mens decrees, and Popes Bulles, for if they giue vs the letter of

The bare letter is no ſcripture.

A ſimilitude

The ſenſe is the life of the vvorde.

Com. ad Gal.

Catholiques estimation of scripture.

scripture, with the true meaning, which is the formal cause and life of the word, we wil reuerence it as the word of God, and preferre it before al the decrees and writinges of Pope and Church: but take the true sense from it, and it is no more scripture, then is a man without a soule, because, as the same body, may be the liuing body of a man, and a dead carcas also, so the same letter with the true meaning, is the word of God, with a false meaning, it is the word of the deuil. As for example, those words of our Sauiour: *The father is greater then I*, taken in the right sense, that is, according to Christes humain nature, are the true word of God, but taken in the meaning of the Arians, who imagined Christ a creature, inferiour euen in person to his father, they are no word of God but of the deuil, vnlesse you wil graunt heresie to be the word of God. The reason of this is, because words, are wordes, in that they are signes of the myndes meaning, and do explicate her inward conceipt; and consequently that is Gods word which explicateth his meaniug, and diuine conceipt; but if it explicate the mynd of the deuil or of his ministers, such as al heretikes are, then is it not the word of God, but rather of the deuil.

A similitude

Io. 14.

The same letter may be the vvord of God and of the deuil.

The reason.

9 Wherfore when the letter of scripture is ioyned with the right meaning, then do wee graunt though men wrote it, that it is the word of God, because it explicateth his meaning, who spake vnto the holy writers in that meaning, and directed their hartes and handes in the writing of the same. In so much that God sayth, to Elaie: *Behold I haue put my vvords in thy mouth* And S. Paul saith that God *diuersly and ly diuers meanes spake in tymes past vnto our forfathers in the Prophets*, that is in the mouth of the prophets, putting in their mouthes, that which they were to speake, and directing their handes to write it. For as the vital spirit of man frameth his wordes in his mouth, and giueth them their meaning, so the words of the prophets, and other holy writers, were framed in their mouthes by the spirit of God. Which is the very cause why diuines saye, that God was the principal speaker, and writer of scripture, and that the Prophet, Apostle, or Euangelist, was his instrument, and as it were the pen, mouth, and tongue of God, in that he was guided and directed by him, and his holy spirit. Wherfore Dauid who was one of these writers sayth, that *His tongue is the penne or quil of him that vvriteth svviftly*: and S. Gregorie, and S. Austine affirme scripture to bee the *venerable stile of* the holy ghost, and S. Basil sayth, that not only the sense of scripture, but also euery word aud tittle is inspired by the holy ghost.

Isa 1.
Heb. 1.
Scripture is the vvord of God
A similitude
Psal. 44.
Præfat. in Mat. 1.
Li 7 conf c. vlt. l 18. Cuit c 38.
in 10. in Hexam.

10 Whe-

10 Wherein a difference is put betwixt ſcripture and definitions of the Church, Pope, or Councels. Becauſe theſe are aſſiſted by the holy ghoſt, only that they may define the truth, and ſo the ſenſe of a Councels definition confirmed by the Pope, is of the holy ghoſt, but it is not neceſſirie that euery word or reaſon in a Councel proceed from the holy ſpirit of God, and therfore diuines ſay that in a Councel, that thing only is neceſſarilie to be beleeued, vvhich the Councel of ſet purpoſe intended to define. But as for other thinges vvhich are ſpoken incidently, and as for reaſons vvhich the Councel alleageth, they are not of that credit, although vvithout euident cauſe they are not to be reiected. And this is the cauſe vvhy the ancient fathers do way & ponder euery word & tittle of ſcripture, which interpretours of the Councels, Canons, or Definitions, do not. Vvherfore (as I ſayd) let them not charge vs vvith cõtempt of ſcripture, for our opinion & eſtimation of ſcripture is moſt venerable, if it be in deede ſcripture, yea we auouch that in it ſelfe it is of far greater authority thẽ is the church or her definitions, becauſe though God aſſiſt both, yet after a more noble manner he aſſiſteth holy vvriters in vvriting of ſcripture, becauſe he aſſiſteth them infaillibly, not only for the ſenſe and veritie, but alſo for euery vvord vvhich they vvrite, and euery reaſon and whatſoeuer is in ſcripture, vvheras he aſſiſteth the Pope and Councel infallibly, only for the ſence and veritie of that vvhich they intend to define, but nether for euery vvord, nor for euerie reaſon, nor for euerie thing, vvhich is incidently ſpoken, as is already declared. And yet vve ſay alſo, that although ſcripture of it ſelfe be greater then the Church, and independent of her, becauſe not from her, but from God it hath authoritie and veritie, yet the Church is better knovvne to vs then ſcripture, & therfore though ſhe make not ſcripture, yet of her we are to learne vvhich is ſcripture, & vvhat is the meaning therof: which is no more diſgrace to ſcripture, then that S. Ihon and the Apoſtles ſhould giue teſtimonie of Chriſt, becauſe they were better knowen then he, though his authoritie in it ſelfe, was greater then theirs, and not depending of them. Yea the reformers, euerie one in particular, be he a cobler, is according to their doctrine, to iudge by his priuate ſpirit, which is ſcripture, and what is the meaning of ſcripture, which ſeemeth to haue more difficultie, then that the church, and her common ſpirit, which Chriſt promiſed her, ſhould chalenge vnto her ſuch authoritie. Giue vs therfore true ſcripture, and we wil reuerence it as the word of God, but corrupt this ſcripture, by putting a falſe ſenſe and

A differenee betvvixt ſcripture & Coũcels.

VVhy fathers vvaye euery vvord of ſcripture.

Hovv God aſſiſteth the vvriters of ſcripture.

Hovv ſcripture dependeth of the church.

See the 3. chs. followving.

Io. 14 15.

and signification to the letter, as the reformers do, and then we wil not acknowledge it for the word of God, becauſe it explicateth not his mind and meaning, but rather we deteſt it, aboue al other wordes and writinges whatſoeuer, becauſe in that it beareth the name of the word of God, and yet is not, it is the moſt pernicious word that is. For as the ſowreſt vineger cometh of the beſt wine, ſo the moſt pernicious word, is the letter of ſcripture corrupted, and miſinterpreted. If then our aduerſaries wil haue ſcripture, to be iudge in cõtrouerſies of religion, let them alleage true ſcripture, that is the letter, with the true meaning, of which not euery priuate ſpirit, but the cõmon ſpirit of the church muſt be iudge, as ſhal heareafter be proued. But if they wil make the bare letter to be iudge, we deny firſt that the bare letter is ſcripture, and then we auouch, that the bare letter is no good rule nor lawful iudge of religion, becauſe the letter of ſcripture, may haue diuers ſenſes, & may ſerue euery heretike, for his purpoſe, as before is declared, and ſo can be no rule nor iudge, which both muſt be aſſured, and certaine.

Scripture euilly interpreted is the vvorſt vvorde A ſimilitude.

The bare letter is no certaine rule.

11. To this they anſwer that ſcripture is ſo eaſie, that the meaning is euident to euery one that hath eyes to ſee it, & ſo he may as eaſilie ſee the conformitie of their religion vnto the rule of ſcripture. For as when the meaſure is known, it is euident how long the cloth is which is meaſured by it, ſo ſcripture, as they ſay, being eaſie, it is moſt euident when religion is true, bicauſe it is euident when it is agreable, and conformable to the aſſured, and knowne meaſure of ſcripture, by which al religions are to be ſquared out and meaſured.

The firſt anſvver is, that Scripture is eaſie.

12 But that ſcripture is not eaſie to be vnderſtood, it is eaſily to be proued, and ſo this anſwere is as eaſilie to be reiected. For firſt ſcripture her ſelfe, confeſſeth her owne obſcuritie. For S. Peter in his epiſtle which is a part of ſcripture, auoucheth that in S. Pauls epiſtles, which our reformers wil not deny to be an other part of ſcripture, *are certain hard things, hard to be vnderſtood, vvhich the vnlearned and vnſtable depraue, alſo the reſt of the ſcriptures, to their ovvne perditiõ.* And S. Auſtin ſaith plainly, that thoſe hard thinges are his commendations of faith, which the ignorant euen from the Apoſtles tyme did ſo miſconſter, as though his meaning had bene, that only faith, without charitie and good workes doth iuſtifie. The Eunuch could not vnderſtand Eſaie without an interpretour, Dauid cryeth for vnderſtanding at Gods hands, before he dareth aduenture to ſearch the law: the Apoſtles could not vnderſtand ſcripturs, til Chriſt opened their ſenſe and eyes of vnderſtanding, and

2. Pet. 3. *Scripture hard.*

lib. de fid. & op. c. 14.

Act. 18.

Pſal. 118.

Luc. 24

yet our

yet our reformers are so eagle-eyed, that they can see clearly, and that at the first sight, into the darkest and obscurest place of scripture. The ancient fathers affirme that scripturs are obscure, and amongest them S. Hierome sayth, that the beginning of Genesis, and the end of Ezechiel, in tymes past, was not permitted to be read of any, til he were thirtie yeares of age: and why, but for the obscuritie which might rather deceue, then direct the younger sorte? S. Austin that great light of the Church, and miraculous vvitte, vvho vvhen he vvas but tvven ie yeares of age vnderstood the predicamentes of Aristotle at the first sight, thought nether so highly of him selfe, nor so basely of scripturs, as to thinke him selfe able by reach of wit, to attain vnto the profound sence and meaning of them, but rather though he had studied them moe dayes & nightes then our ministers haue done dayes only, yea or houres, and had written more for the interpreting of scripturs then euer they read, yet saieth he: *So great is the profunditie of them, that I might euery day make profit in them, if I should vvith greatest leisure, greatest studie, and better vvitt, endeuour to come vnto the knovvledg of them only, and that from my tender youth vnto crooked olde age.* And in his bookes which he wrote vpon Gen., in his tractes vpon S Ihon, & diuers other partes of scripture, he moueth many doubtes and difficulties: and yet Luther sayth that scripturs are more playn and easie then al the fathers commentaries. Petrus Lombardus commonly called the maister of sentences, S. Thomas & other diuines armed vvith philosophie, and furnished with the schoole literature, apply not vvithstanding al their wittes to the explicating of the first chapter of Genesis, and the creation of the world in the first six dayes, as also S. Basil, S. Ambrose & others do. And yet Luther boldly affirmeth, that no part of scripture is to be called or counted obscure. S. Gregorie Nazianzen and S. Basil studied scriptures for thirtene yeares together, and yet durst not swerue a iotte from the interpretation of the auncient fathers. S. Hierom not withstanding that he was so wel seene in the Greeke and Hebrew tongue, and other both prophane and sacred literature, yet went he as far as Alexandria to conferre with Didimus. Who also running after a cursorie manner ouer al the bookes of scripture, fyndeth such difficultie in euery one, as though he vnderstood this only in scripture that he vnderstandeth not scripture, or as though this only in scripture were easie to be vnderstood, that scripture is not easie, & ending with the Apocalipse thus he concludeth: *Apocalypsis Ioannis tot habet sacramenta quot verba, parum dixi pro merito voluminis, laus omnis inferior est,*

Ep. ad Paul.

l. 4. conf. c. 16

Ep. 3. ad Volus

Præfat. assert.

l. 2. d 12. & p. 1. q. 65.

in Hexamer.

l. de seruo arbit.

Ruff. l. 11. c. 9.

Ep. 65. 103.

Al scripture is hard to S. Hierome.

All scripture is hard to S. Hierome.

in verbis singulis multiplices latent intelligentiæ: The Apocalipse of Ihon hath as many sacraments as words, I haue sayed litle for the merit of the volume, al prayse is inferiour, in euerie word there lye hidden many senses and meaninges. And yet Luther and Caluin, and commonly Puritanes and Protestants, auouch scripture to be so facile and perspicuous, that by the owne light you may see it, and see into it, and neede no more helpe of an interpretour, then of a candle to see the sunne, when it shineth in the midde-daye.

But easie to our heretikes,

Why then disagree they? Why retaine they a lecture of diuinitie.

13 But if this doctrine be true, why is ther such contention amongst the reformers for the true explication of scripture? Why did the Fathers, and why do the reformers make so large commentaries vppon scripture? Why retayne they a diuinitie lesson in Oxford and other vniuersities, especially now that they haue turned the Bible into the vulgare tongue, which being done, by the priuate spirit of the minister at the first sight, it is easilie vnderstood? If this be true, then certainly had the auncient fathers very dul pates, who with al their studie, industrie, prayer, fasting, solitude, tongues, philosophie, and sanctitie of life, could not attaine to that knowledge of scripture in a long lifes tyme, which a minister by and by getteth at the first opening of the Bible.

Experience teacheth scripture to be harde.

14 But tel me in good sadnes: are you in iest or earnest when you say that scripture is easie? When you read the first chap. of Gen. the prophecies, especially of Daniel, the Psalmes of Dauid, Iobes witty sayinges, Salomons Prouerbes and Canticles, saint Paules epistles, S. Ihons Apocalipse, do you finde no difficultie? I can not thinke it, because euen experience teacheth that nothing is more euident, then that scripture is not euident. For first the very letter and phrase of scripture is obscure and ambiguous. Secondly many speeches in scripture are prophetical, many parabolical, many metaphorical, which commonly are ful of obscuritie. Thirdly it is proper to scripture to haue many senses vnder one letter, as the literal sence which the holy writer first intended, and this sense some tymes is signified by proper words, some tymes metaphorical, yea sometymes also this literal sense vnder one letter, is diuers. Sometymes the sense is spiritual, which is that which the thinges vnder the letter do signifie: as for example those words of S. Paul: *Abraham had two sonnes one of the handmayd another of the free woman*, literally do signifie Abrahames two sonnes, because, that, the letter importeth, and that first is intended, but these two sonnes were figures of the old and new Testament, or the two peoples which liued

Three causes of the difficultie of scripture.

The literal sense.

The spiritual sense.

Gal. 4.

An example.

vnder

vnder those Testaments, and so this is the spiritual signification of those words, which they not immediatly, but by meanes of those two sonnes do signifie. And this spiritual sence is ether moral, or tropologieal, when it tendeth to manners, or allegorical, which tendeth to fayth or the Church, or anagogical, which tendeth to heauen or life euerlasting. Wherfore this worde, Hierusalem, literally signifieth the citie so called, morally, the soule of man which God inhabiteth by good life or the deuil by bad, allegorically, the Church militant, and anagogically, heauen, and the Church triumphant. Now who is he that dareth promise to tel vs infaillibly, when a place of scripture is to be vnderstood literally, or spiritually, and in what literal or spiritual meaning? Saint Hierom affirmeth, that Apollinaris, Tertulian, and Lactantius, and other Millenarians, imagined after the resurrection, a reedification of the Temple and terrestrial Hierusalem, and that Christ in it should raigne for a thousand yeares, and we that tyme should liue in al corporal pleasurs, because they vnderstood certaine places of scripture literally and properly, which should haue been vnderstood spiritually and metaphorically. And contrariwise the same father ascribeth Origens errours in the exposition of the beginning of Genesis to no other cause, thē that he imagined that the sayd chapter ought to be vnderstood metaphorically & spiritually, which should haue beene interpreted historically, properlie, and literallie. And what man in his witte, can thinke it so easie to hit alwayes of the right sense, where the senses are so diuerse, and in which so many learned men haue banguered.

The spiritual sense, moral, allegorical anagogical.

In c. 36. Ezec.

Ep. ad Paul.

15 Truly when I consider with my selfe how euident a thing it is that scriptures are hard and obscure, I meruaile how our reformers can perswade them selues that scriptures are easie. and some tymes I am induced to thinke that when they say so, they speake not as they thinke: but yet when I cal to mynd another opinion of theirs, which is, that the true meaning of scripture is that, which euerie ones priuate spirit imagineth, I see it to bee as easie to interpret scripture, as to imagin, which is most easie, because the imagination is free, & can as wel imagin Chimeraes as true obiectes. As for example, if that were the true meaning of Aristotle, which euery one would imagin, then were it an easie matter for euery cobler to vnderstand Aristotle, were he in Greek or Latin, because he can imagin what it pleaseth him with great facilitie. And this if I be not deceaued, is the cāse why now euery sister of the lord whom S. Paul cōmaunded to be silent in the Church, wil needs be a biblist

The reason vvhy scripture seemeth easie to heretikes.

An example.

The cause of vvomens boldnes vvith scripture.

a bibliſte & an interpretour of Scripture. For if that be the true ſenſe of ſcripture which the priuate ſpirit imagineth, if ſhe haue the ſpirit (as why ſhould ſhe not as wel as the miniſter eſpecially it being a receaued doctrine amongſt them that euery one by his priuate ſpirit can iudge of ſcripture) why may not ſhe comment vppon the ſcripture, and mount alſo into the pulpit, there to preach the doctrine of her ſpirit. But o fancies, o Luciferian pride, to which hereſie leadeth, euen the frayle and imperfect Sexe, which nature ſeemeth to haue debarred from pulpits. This pride Tertulian eſpyed in the heretical women of his tyme. *Ipſæ mulieres hereticæ quam ſunt procaces quæ docere audent, contendere exorciſmis agere, curationes repromittere, forſitan & tingere: Euen the heretical vvomen hovv malapert are they, vvhich dare be ſo bold as to teach, and to take vpon them to exorciſe, and to promiſe miraculous cures, yea perhaps to baptize.* And vvheras Apprentices are bound ſeauen yeares to an occupation, to learne only a mechanical trade, the art and ſcience of expounding ſcripture, which is the higheſt ſcience that is, ſeemeth to theſe ſubtile wittes ſo eaſie, that as Sainct Hierome obſerued in ſome of his tyme, euery cobler, euery olde trot, and doting foole, can with out a Doctour fynd out the ſecret meaning of ſcripture, and teach before they be raught.

Lib. præſc.

Heretikes make mecanical artes harder then ſcripture. ep. ad paulin.

16 But let them ſay and beleeue if they can or wil, that ſcripture is eaſie, the experience and reaſon which I haue alleaged wil proue the contrarie. And truly if hony be hidden in the combe, marow in the bone, and pretiouſe ſtones in the ſea: if gold be gotten with labour out of the bowels and ſecret vaines of the earth, and roſes be hedged in with pricking thornes, if nature hath hidden al perfection and natural ſciences, & vealed them with ſuch obſcuritie, that without great induſtrie they can not be diſcouered, good reaſon vvas there that the myſtical meanings and ſacred ſenſes of ſcripture, ſhould be vealed with an obſcure letter, and couered with many ænigmatical ſpeeches.

nature hideth perfectiõ, and ſelles it for labour.

17 For firſt by reaſon of this difficultie the ſtudy of ſcripture asketh a mans wholle life, and ſo keeping him occupied, diſtracteth him from prophane, idle, and euil occupations. Secondly the difficultie of ſcriptur makes a man to haue a better eſteeme & higher conceipt of the ſame, becauſe things eaſily learned are eaſilie contemned; & knowlege hardly gotten is highly prized. And therfore as S. Auſtin noteth, the holy ghoſt in ſcripture hath prouided eaſie things to ſatisfie our hunger, & obſcure places alſo, to take away lothſomnes. Becauſe our vnderſtanding with eaſie things only, would be ſoone cloyed, & with

The firſt reaſon vvhy God vvould haue ſcripture hard

The ſecond reaſon. li. 2. doct. Chriſt. c. 6.

obſcuritie

obſcuritie only, would eaſilie be deterred. Thirdly this difficultie imprinteth in our memorie the word of God more deeply. For as the iron is more hard to receaue impreſſion then wax or vvater, yet keepeth it more firmly, ſo that which we learne hardly, we forget not eaſilie. Fourthly it controleth our high-clyming and deepe ſearching wittes and maketh vs to acknowledge the weaknes of our intellectual eyeſight, which if it be ſo dimme, that it can no more ſuſteyne the blazing ſpendour of natural verities, then can the night crowes eyes the beames of the ſunne, much leſſe can it behold (vnleſſe it be by a glimſe and glimmering) the ſplendent rayes of ſupernatural verities, reuealed through the darke veale of holy ſcripture. Fiftly this difficultie increaſeth merit and deſert, when ſo conſtantly we beleeue thoſe verities which in ſcripture are rather vealed then reuealed. Sixthly this difficultie preſerueth ſcripture from prophanation, and is the cauſe why euerie one can not babble of ſcripture as they do of eaſie thinges, and as the heretiques of this tyme do, becauſe they imagin ſcripture to be eaſie. Seauenthly it hides our ſacred myſteries from prophane infidells, who are no more worthy of this diuine knowledge then are the beaſtly ſwine of precioufe pearles. Eightly as Cirill or rather Origin very wel obſerueth, theſe obſcure phraſes and figures, wherin the diuine veritie is clad, are as it were a ſeemly habit, which graceth the word of God, and makes it ſeeme the better vnto our weakiſh eyes. For more are we delighted to ſee the veritie of the ſacred Euchariſt, vnder the figure of Manna, and of the Sacrament of Baptiſme, in that ſhadow of the red ſea, then if we ſawe the ſame ſet forth to our vew, in bare wordes though neuer ſo playn.

The third. A ſimilitude

The fourth.

The fiſte.

Sixte.

The Seuenth.

Orig. li. 1. in Leuit.

The eight.

18 But now let vs ſee what our ghoſpellers can ſaye to this experience, and reaſon, by which I haue proued ſcriptures to be hard and difficile? It is true, ſayth Luther, ſcriptures are in many places hard, but where they treat of thinges neceſſarie to ſaluation, there are they playn and perſpicuouſe. Is it true (Luther) that ſome partes of ſcripture are hard? then muſt thou eate that word of thine in which thou ſaydſt. *Ego de tota ſcriptura dico, nullam eius partem obſcuram dici volo. I ſay of al ſcripture, I vvil haue no part of it called obſcure.* And wilt thou ſtand to it, that where ſcripture treateth of thinges neceſſarie to ſaluation, there it is plain and eaſie? I aske then of thee, whether the doctrine of Baptiſme be not neceſſarie to ſaluation? And if thou ſay yea, then is ſome part of ſcripture, which treateth of thinges neceſſarie, hard and difficile, for otherwiſe Caluin vvould neuer

The firſt anſvvere of heretikes.

The refutation of it.

Præfat aſſert. art. l. de ſeruo arbit.

Io. 3. Harm. ibid. haue cauilled ſo much about thoſe wordes of Chriſt: *Vnleſſe a man be borne againe of water and the holy ghoſte.* Is not the doctrine of the bleſſed Sacrament neceſſary to be beleeued? And yet vvho ſeeth not, how many diuerſe expoſitions the ghoſpellers haue deuiſed vppon thoſe few words, *This is my bodie*? Is not the doctrine of iuſtification neceſſarie? And yet it is ſo obſcurely ſet downe in ſcripture, that Oſiander auoucheth, that amongſt the cõfeſſioniſtes, there are twentie different opinions about the formal cauſe of iuſtification, & euery one is deduced out of ſcripture. At leaſt they wil graunt me that the doctrine and fayth of the bleſſed Trinitie and of Chriſtes diuinitie, and humanitie, is of neceſſitie to be beleeued: & yet the Ebionites, Arrianes, Neſtorians, Eutichians, Valentinians, Monothelites, and Appollinariſtes, who held diuerſe hereſies concerning the Trinitie and Incarnation, proued them al to their thinking, out of ſcripture. Vvhich is a ſigne that ſcripture is not eaſie: for where al is playne, al men commonly aggree, and if ſcripture where it ſpeaketh of thoſe myſteries, were perſpicuouſe, they would neuer haue banguered ſo groſſely in expounding them.

Mat. 26. Luc. 22. Bel. l. 1. de Euch. c. 28. Ex Bel. to. 1. l. 2. de Iuſtif. initio to. 1. l. 5. c. 1. de Verbi dei interpret.

The ſecond anſvver. The refutation. 19 But rather then my aduerſarie wil ſtand out, he wilbe content to play ſmale play. If, ſayth, he thou be a good Grãmarian, al wil ſeeme eaſie vnto thee. And was not I pray thee S. Auſtin who read Rhetorike in Millan, was not S. Hierom, who was excellent in al the three tongues, a grammarian? They were, they were, and yet they confeſſed as I haue declared, that ſcriptures were ful of difficultie. Yea in England our miniſters haue the Bible in Engliſh, and ſo haue no neede of any helpe of Grammer, and yet can they not aggree about the ſcriptures meaning. Yea in al ſciences, it is one thing to be a grammarian another thing to attayne to the knowledge of the ſcience: for many a ſchoole maiſter in England can conſtrew Ariſtotle, which yet can not vnderſtand him, and if grammer were ſufficient, then after grammer, we ſhould neede no ſtudie, nether in diuinitie nor philoſphie, nor any other ſcience: And to vſe no other argument then experience, let our grammarians in England after they haue conſtrewed the pſalmes, tel me whether they do yet vnderſtand the pſalmes?

Supra.

Another anſvver. The refutation. 20 But my aduerſary wil ſhew that he is not tongue-tyed and therfore wil not be put to ſilence. If (ſayeth he) you confer one place vvith another, one wil explicate another. This is another ſtarting hole vvhich he hath found out. But this alſo, is but a poore ſhifte. For although one place conferred vvith another, many tymes giueth a great

great light to both, yet doth it not so allwayes fal out. For diuerse haue conferred the same places, and yet haue gathered diuerse meaninges: yea somtymes conference of places augmenteth the difficultie, and maketh a show of contradiction, which before appeared not. As for example, that of Genesis: *It is not good that man be alone*, conferred with that of S. Paule to the Corinthians: *It is good that a man touche not a vvoman*, seemeth to imply a plaine contradiction That also of Genesis: *Encrease and multiplie*, seemeth quite contrarie to that of our Sauiour: *Happie are the barrein vvhich haue not borne children.* Moyses also sayeth that *God tempted Abraham*, and yet S. Iames sayeth, *God tempteth no man* And Christe commaundeth that, *soe our light shine before men that they may see our good vvorkes*: And in the next Chapter, hee biddeth vs *Take heede, that vvee doe not our iustice before men to bee seene of them.* S. Paule describinge his vocation, vision, and conuersion, sayeth, *that his companie heard a voice, but savve no body*: and yet afterwarde he sayth, that *they savve a lighte but hearde no voice.* In his Epistle also to the hebrewes he sayeth, *that in the Arke vvas a golden pott of Manna, Aarons rod & the tables*: And yet in the third booke of Kinges wee reade that in the Arke *Vvas nothinge else but the tables of the lavve.* To bee breise, S. Marke, S. Luke, and S. Iohn, say the woemen came to Christes monument in the morninge, S Mathewe, in the Eueninge. Soe that Collation of places, manie tymes augments the difficultie, and maketh a contradiction to arise, vvhere none before appeared.

Gen. 2. 1. *Cor.* 7. *Gen.* 1. *Luc.* 23. *Gen.* 22. *Iac.* 1. *Mat.* 5. *Mat.* 6. *Act.* 9. *Act.* 22. *Heb.* 9. 3. *Reg.* 3. *Mar.* 16. *Luc.* 24. *Io.* 20 *Mat.* 28.

21. Nowe gentle reader thou wouldst think that this man were satisfied, or else that his mouth were stopped, but yet he desireth one answere more, and if that vvil not serue, he wil ether yeeld or hold his peace. If you pray to God (sayth he) to illuminate you, he wil reveal the meaning of scripture vnto you, or if you haue the spirit, & be not carnal but spiritual, or if you be prædestinate, you shal find al as playne in scripture, as the kinges high way. This answere is so poore, that it wel argueth that our aduersarie is put to an harde shift and to a last reply: because in this answere hee declareth *ignotum per ignotius, an vnknovven thing by that vvhich is more vnknovven.* As for example, I vvould haue him to assure vs whether that wee expound scripture rightly or vvrongly, & hee telleth vs that if we praye as vvee ought to do, or if wee bee of the electe, or if wee bee spiritual men, wee shal easilie find out the meaning of holy scripture. And seing that nothing is more vncertayne then whether wee praye as wee ought to do, vvhether vvee bee electe or no, or vvhether wee bee true

The fourth answver.

The refutation.

bee true ſpiritual men or no: by this rule vvee ſhal neuer bee aſſured of the true ſenſe of ſcripture. And vvere not I praye you S. Auſtin, S. Hierom, and other Fathers before mentioned, the elect Saintes of God? was it not like that if any prayed aright, that they did ſo? vvere not they liker to bee ſpiritual men, then our fleſhly ghoſpellers, whom their vviues can not content? Or can the reformers aſſure vs that they them ſelues are electe, that they praye iuſte as thy ought to do, that they are ſpiritual menne, vvho haue the right ſpirit of interpreting ſcripture? It followeth therfore, vvhich I intended to proue, that if vve beleeue the reformers, becauſe they alleage ſcriptures according to their owne expoſition, vvee muſt of neceſſitie giue eare vnto al falſe prophetes, vvho can, and haue already, & herafter vvil alleage ſcripture for vvhat ſoeuer they ſhal preach: and ſo if theſe Reformers be admitted, no heretikes nor hereſies can be excluded or reiected. Which concluſion, although it neceſſarily proceedeth from the premiſes, which before are layed dovvne, yet to helpe the readers memorie, I vvil laye them dovvne again breefly, that out of them he maye gather the intended concluſion more eaſily.

A repetition of that vvich before is ſayd,

22 Thou muſt therfore (gentle reader) cal to mynd which before is proued: to wit that it hath alwayes bene the manner of heretikes, though they had no right thervnto (the Romain church being euer the right owner) to alleage Scripture, therby to grace their hereſies: and that they might ſay what they liſted, and frame Scripture to their doctrine, and not their doctrine to Scripture: if Scripture chanced to be ſo plaine againſt them that it could not bee gloſſed, they would flatly deny that parte, if it were ambiguous, they would expound it as they liſted to make it ſpeake as they wiſhed: litle caring that the church and fathers, other wiſe expounded: Which Scripture though with ſuch a meaning it was in deed no Scripture, yet the bare letter and name ſufficed for their purpoſe. And ſeing that Luther, Caluin, and al the packe of our new preachers, can ſay no more nor bring any other proofe for their doctrine, if we admit & receue them, wee can reiect no heretike at al, ether of former, or preſent, or future tymes. For what can luther and Caluin alleage which olde heretikes, haue not hertofore alleaged? Luther and Caluin alleage ſcripture: ſo did they. If Scriptures were playne againſt old heretikes, they plainly denyed them: So do luther and caluin. If Scripture were ambiguous, they expounded it to their own aduantage: So did luther & caluin, & no better nor no other proofe can they bring. Wherfore if we receiue Lu-

ue Luther, Caluin, or any of the new preachers, we open the way to al heretikes that euer were or shal be: becauſe where the ſame proofe is alleaged, the ſame credit muſt be giuen, vnles we wil be partial. And for as much as we can not giue credit to them al, becauſe they teach contraries, yea & contradictions, our beſt wil be to giue eare to none of them al, but rather to liſten to the cõmon receiued, that is, the Romane Church, who as ſhe hath euer had the cuſtody of the book of Scripture, ſo is it moſt like that ſhe beſt knoweth the meaning of it, hauing this book from the Apoſtles, and with it, the Apoſtles and their Succeſſours interpretation.

The third Chapter treateth of the priuat ſpirit. vvhich the pretended Reformers hauc made ſupreme iudge in earth, in the interpretation of ſcripture: vvherby, as it is proued, the vvay is opened to al heretikes, and none can be excluded, if theſe nevv Reformers be admitted to determine of religion by the priuat ſpirit.

SELFE-loue (ſayth one) is as good as guilding, which maketh that to ſeme goodly, wherin our ſelues be parties. For as guidling maketh al to ſeme gold, be it but ſtone or wood vnderneath: So ſelfeloue maketh to our ſelues, euen our ſelues, and al our actions to ſeme comelie and ſemely, be they neuer ſo abſurd and vnſemely. *Suum cuique pulchrum* (ſayth the latin prouerbe) to which is anſwearable in Engliſh: Euerie man as he likes, quoth the goodman to his cow. To Pan, his owne pipe and piping ſounded more melodiouſely then Apollo his harpe and harping. Euery mayd thinketh her ſelfe of al to be the fayreſt, or if ſhe acknowledge any one defect in beautie, ſhe thinks that to be counteruayld in many other perfections. Euery mother deems her owne children the beſt fauoured, to euery henne her owne chickenes are moſt pleaſing, yea euery owle & crow thinketh her own youngone fayrer & betrer fethered, then the white doue, hauke, or Eagle. Artizanes prayſe moſt their owne workmanſhip, Poets price their owne poemes at the higheſt rate, and euery ſcholar thinketh his own witte moſt pregnant, and euery doctor preferreth his owne books and vvritinges before al other. Yea al men by

Selfe loue.

A ſimilitude.

The blindnes of ſelfe loue.

Examples.

nature not ruled by reason, nor corrected by grace, fal most willingly in loue with their own conceipts, and the broods and young ones of their owne deuising wittes. The reason herof is, owne selfe, to which, as euery one is more neere, then to an other, so is he most addicted and affected. For to our selues we are one, to others we are only vnited, and so first we like our selues, and our owne doings, next of al, those and their actions, who are nearest and most vnited vnto vs. Wherfore although, in that God is chiefest good & goodnesse it selfe, he should by al reason be first and best beloued, yet becausse he is not so neere vnto vs, as we are to our selues, we giue the maydenhead and prime of our affection vnto our selues. This S. Bernarde in his book which he made of the loue of God obserued long since. *Imprimis* (sayeth he) *diligit homo seipsum propter se, caro quippe est & nihil sapere valet, cum que se videt per se non posse subsistere, Deum sibi quasi necessarium incipit diligere, at verò cum Deum cœperit, occasione propriæ necessitatis, colere & diligere, Deus illi dulcescit, & sic gustando quam suauis est Dominus, transit ad tertium gradum & diligit Deum propter se: First of al man loueth him selfe for him selfe, because he is flesh, and can like of nothing but him selfe, and when he seeth that of him selfe he can not stand he beginneth to loue God as a thing necessarie vnto him: but when he beginneth to loue God vpon occasion of his owne necessitie, then God beginneth to waxe sweet vnto him, and so by tasting how sweet God is, he passeth to the third degree and loueth God for him selfe.* And as we loue our selues and our own thinges best, so doth this selfe loue blinde vs & hide from our owne eyes our owne defectes Wherfore Demosthenes was wont to say, that it is a most easie thing to deceiue our selues, for while we desire especially to haue our owne actions liked, we easily persuade our selues, that they are to be liked. And therfore Plato counsayleth euery man to flye this vice of selfe loue which the Grecians cal *Philautia*, and not be ashamed to learne of others, especially when they are our betters.

The reason why selfloue is beliued.

God should be first and best beloued l. de diligendo Deo.

But we first loue our selues

Selfeloue hideth our defectes.

l. 9. de leg. l. 9

2. Now if euer any were sick of this disease, it is the heretike, especially of our tyme, who preferreth his owne opinion before the common consent of Fathers, and his owne priuate and particular spirit, before the common spirit of the Church: who though a by general councel, in which al the grauitie, sanctitie, wisdom, and learning of the Church is assembled together, define the contrary, wil neuer change his opinion, but wil prefer his owne particular opinion and priuate spirite, before al councelles, fathers, ages, & Churches: and he but one, will stand against al, and he but one, will be iudge of al, in interpreting of scripture, and will be iudged of none. This intole-

An Heretike especially is sick of selfe-loue.

l. 8. cont. ber. c. 2.

rable

rable pride & ſelf loue of their owne opinions, S. Ireneus auoucheth to be a common diſeaſe amongeſt heretikes. *Vnuſquiſque* (ſayth he) *fictionem quàm à ſemetipſo adinuenit, illam eſſe ſapientiam dicit, ſeque indubitatè & incontaminatè & ſincerè abſconditum ſcire myſterium. Euery one ſayeth that his owne, vvhich he hath deuiſed, is vviſdome, and that he vndoubtedly, incontaminatly, and ſincerely doth knovv the hidden myſterie.* Arius that famous or rather infamous heretike, not for ſpoiling Dianaes temple, but for robbing Chriſt of his diuinitie, vvas ſo vviſe in his ovvne conceipte, that he thought none of the ancient Fathers vvorthie to be compared vvith him. Aetius an other ſouldiour of Lucifers bande, vvas vvonte to ſay that he knevv God, as vvel as he knevv him ſelfe. Manicheus bragged, that he vvas not only an Apoſtle of Chriſt, but alſo a Paraclete. Neſtorius eloquent in dede, though not ſo ſvvet in vtering, as forvvard to come to the vtteraunce, took ſuch pleaſure therin, that he had no minde to read the ancient Fathers.

The ,pride of Arius. *Nic. l. 8. c. 7. l. 4. c. 22.* *Of Aetius.* *Theodoret. l. 4. her. fab.* *Aug. cont. ep. fund.* *of Neſtorius.* *Socr. l. 2. c. 28.*

3. But to leaue the olde, and to come to our newborne heretikes, you ſhal ſee that in this ſelfe loue & liking of their owne opiniõs, they degenerate not a iotte from their ancetours. Luther ſeing him ſelfe oftentimes to be preſſed vvith the old fathers authority, preferreth his owne priuate opinion before their common ſentẽce, and decree, & bluſheth not a vvhit at the matter. *Nihil curo* (ſayth he) *ſi mille Auguſtini, mille Cypriani, mille Eccleſiæ contra me ſentiant: I care not if a thouſand Auguſtines, a thouſand Ciprianes, a thouſand Churches thinke othervviſe then I do.* And in an other place: *Doctrinam meam* (ſayth he) *noloiudicari à quoquam, nec ab Epiſcopis, nec ab Angelis omnibus, volo per eam & Angelorum iudex eſſe: I vvil not haue my doctrine iudged of any, nether of Bishops, nor of al Angells, I vvil by my doctriue be iudge euen of the Angels.* And againe in an other booke of his: ego (ſayth he) *in hoc libro non contuli, ſed aſſerui, & aſſero, nec penes vllum, iudicium eſſe volo, ſed omnibus ſuadeo vt præſtent obſequium. I haue not conferred in this booke but I haue affirmed, and I affirme, nether vvil I that any man iudge herof, but I counſayle al to obey myn opinion.* But eſpecially he triumpheth in an other place of the afore ſaied booke which he wrote againſt Henry the eight *Ioppoſe* (ſayth he) *the Goſpel* (but expounded as he pleaſeth) *againſt the ſayings of fathers, and Angeles* (as though Angeles vvere in opinion contrary to the Goſpel) *Here I ſtand, here I remane, here I glorie, here I triumphe, here I inſulte, againſt the Papiſtes, Thomiſtes, Henriciſtes, Sophiſtes, and al the ſayings of men, though neuer ſo holy.* See how this man pleaſeth him ſelfe in his ovvn opinion, & how he preferreth it before al men and Angeles. For although he wil ſeeme to preferre only the Goſpel before them, yet ſeing that the con-

Luthers Luciferian pride. *Li. cont. Regem Angl.* *Prol. lib. cont. ſtatuta Eccleſiæ.* *L. de ſeruo arbitrio.* *Intolerable arrogancie.* *Luther preferreth him ſelfe before al Fathers and Angels.*

trouersie is not betwixt Scriptures, & Fathers (becauſe the Fathers reuerenced Scriptures more then euer Luther did) but whether Luther or they expoũded Scripture rightly? he in dede preferreth him ſelf before al the Fathers that euer were: & in conceipt triũpheth ouer them al, but before the victorie. Caluin alſo in this ſelfe pleaſing opinion ſhoweth him ſelf as bragging, & Thraſonical as Luther for his hart, & contendeth with him, who ſhal ſtout it moſt. *Nulla* (ſayth he) *Conciliorum Paſtorum, Epiſcoporum nomina, nos impedire debent, quo minus omnes omnium ſpiritus, ad diuini verbi regulam exigamus: No names of Councels, Paſtours, Bishops, ought to hinder vs from examining the ſpirits of al men, by the diuine vvord* And in an other chapter of the ſame book, explicating thoſe words of ſcripture: *This is my bodie* in a contrary ſenſe to the Lutherans, he ſayeth, that he *hauing by diligent meditation examined thoſe vvordes, doth imbrace that ſenſe vvhich the ſpirit telleth him, and leaning to that* (ſayth he) *I diſpiſe the vviſdom of al men, vvhich can be oppoſed againſt me.* See, ſee, the pride of an heretike. may not Luther & euery falſe prophet ſay, that he hath vſed diligence, and that the ſpirit telleth him the contrary? Were not the Fathers as diligẽt, as Caluin, as wiſe, as learned, and as vertuouſe, who expounded thoſe vvordes in their proper ſenſe? No, no, one Caluin in his owne conceipt ſurpaſſeth them al, and his opinion and priuat ſpirit muſt take the place, and vpper hand of al the Auſtines, Ambroſes, Gregories, Hieromes, of al the Councels, yea and Churches alſo, although they were thouſands in number. Of theſe mens priuate ſpirits may be ſayed, that of the Poet *Suã cuique Deus fit dira cupido: Euery ones cruel luſt is his God. Sibi quiſque profecto eſt Deus: Euery one truly is to him ſelfe a God.* For theſe men eſpecially, who preferre their priuat opinions before Fathers, Councells, Churches, yea and Angels alſo, What do they but adore the idols of their owne imaginations, as their God? Truly theſe men which are not *ſicut cæteri homines, like other men*, are eith her goddes, or beaſts, & that by the ſentence of Ariſtotle, the prince of Philoſophers. For if by this philoſophers verdict, ſolitarie men or rather haters of ſocietie, whom the Grecians vſe to cal *Miſantropi*, be either gods or ſauage beaſtes, vvhat are theſe men, vvho flying alwayes the company, and common conſent of Chriſtians, vvil go alone in al their opinions, and ſymbolize or ſorte them ſelues with no men. But this it is to leaue the Catholique Church, vvhich vvhen the heretike forſaketh, he biddeth adieu to al Fathers, Councels, Antiquitie, & common conſent, vvhich only are to be found in this Church; and muſt of neceſſitie ſtand poſt alone, and ſtick to his priuat ſpirit, and opinion, againſt

Caluin as Thraſonical.

l. 4. Inſt c. 9.

c. 17. & c. 25.

Mat. 26.

Virg. Æneid 9.

Ouid. met. 8.

The heretikes priuat opinion and ſpirit is his God.

He is either a God or a beaſt.

To leaue the church is to ſtand poſt alone.

againſt al the Chriſtian vvorld. I vvould S. Bernard had bene to deale with theſe ſingular ſpirits; but becauſe he is ridde of ſuch trubleſome companions, we wil at leaſt alleage his words, vvhich he once vſed againſt one Petrus Abailardus, poſſeſſed with the ſame euil ſpirit, who ſayed, that man was not deliuered by Chriſt from captiuitie of the diuel. *Although* (ſayeth he) *the Doctors of the Church thinck the contrary, yet other vviſe it ſeemeth vnto me. VVhat* (ſayeth S. Bernard) *ſhal I deme more intolerable in theſe vvords, blaſphemie, or arrogancie? VVhat more damnable rashnes or impietie? VVere it not more mete that ſuch a mouth ſhould be hobbed & beaten vvith ſtones, then refuted by reaſons? doth he not iuſtly prouoke al mens hands againſt him, vvhoſe hands are againſt al? Al* (ſayeth he) *thinke thus, but I think othervviſe. But vvhat doſt thou think? vvhat bringeſt thou better, VVhat more ſubtilitie doeſt thou find, vvhat greater ſecret doeſt thou boaſte to haue bene reuealed vnto thee, vvhich hath not bene knovven to ſo many Saincts, vvhich hath eſcaped ſo many vviſemen? yet tel vs, vvhat that is, VVhich ſeemeth true vnto thee, & vnto no man elſe?* And ſo forth. If to theſe vvords of S. Bernard (gentle reader) thou adde Luther or Caluin, in ſteed of Petrus Abailardus, and putting out his ſingular opinion, put one of theirs in the place, thou wilt eaſily perceiue, that theſe vvords may as wel be vſed againſt them as him, for they are, no leſſe ſingular then he, as appeareth by their proud aſſerrions, vvhich I haue alleaged, & may appeare more by their opiniõs of the priuate ſpirit, which in other places they make the iudge of the meaning of Scriptures, and of al other controuerſies of religion. Do not they ſay ſtil in effect, that which S. Bernard calleth intolerable and damnable: *I ſay ſo, let al the vvorld ſaye the contrarie?* Do not they prefer their owne expoſition of Scripture, before Fathers, Councels, Churches, yea Angels alſo? Do not their mouthes out of which haue proceded ſuch arrogãt ſpeaches, deſerue rather to be beaten vvith ſtones, then to be refuted by reaſons.

Epiſt. 190

S. Bernards ſentence againſt proud ſpirites.

Luth. art. 27. 28.

Calu. l. 2. Inſt. & l. 4. Inſt. c. 9. 17.

4 Behold Englãd my deare & fouly deceaued countrie, to what pride theſe Lucifers haue induced thee. Why didſt thou forſake the Romain Church, which vvas euer taken, euen of infidels, for the only Chriſtian ſocietie? Vvhõ diddeſt thou folow, when thou didſt leaue that Church, but only a ſingular ſpirit? And vvhereon now doeſt thou rely, vvheron doeſt thou ground thy religion? Not vpon Fathers, nor Councels, not Antiquitie, nor Church, nor common conſent, for al theſe, thy nevv Apoſtles vvhom thou haſt folowed, haue reiected. Doeſt thou then rely vpon Luther or Caluin, or the nevv found miniſteres? Thou ſeeſt by the firſt chapter, how they can not proue their miſſion, nor diſtinguiſh them ſelues from falſe prophets, which are aſſuredly to come, & are al

A iuſt complaint.

VVhat England hath gained by leauing of the Church.

ready come. And what reason hadst thou to forsake thy graue and learned forefathers, for these skipiacks, and the common spirit of the Church, for their singular spirits, which are so priuate that thou shalt hardly finde two of them, conspiring in one opinion? Doest thou ground thyself on scripture? Bare scripture, as I haue proued, in the second chapter, is no sure ground vvithout the true sense, and how doest thou know that thou hast the right meaning of scripture? I know thyn answer: My spirit (sayest thou) telleth me so. This then is thy staye, this is thy ground in religion, this is thy last refuge, which thou must needs stick vnto, as I haue declared, when thou leauest the Catholique Church. But is it not intolerable pride, to make thy priuat spirit to be iudge of scripture and sense of scripture? Is not this intolerable arrogancie, to make thy owne priuate spirit iudge of Councels, Fathers, Church and al, and to prefer thyn owne priuat opinion, before their common consent, as though thou being but one, couldst see further into scripture, and that at the first reading, then they al could do, by great studie and labour?

Intolerable pride and as great follie.

5 Thou wilt answere that no lesse is the pride of the Pope, who being but one man wil censure al men, and bynd them al to accorde to his priuate sentence and definition, and consequently, that thou hast as good assurance as Catholiques haue, yea better. Because the Catholique in matters of faith relyeth vpon the priuate spirit of the Pope, thou standest to the censure of thy owne spirit, of wich thou hast better assurance, then hath the Catholique of the spirit of the Pope, because a mans owne spirit is better knowen vnto him, then is the spirit of an other. To this I answere. That we haue not the Popes warrant only for our religion, but we haue first the consent of fathers, which as I shal proue in the next chapter, is an infallible rule because they being appointed our pastours, & we being commanded to obey them, if they could al conspire in an errour, we should be led with them into errour, & not they only but God also, who is truth it selfe, should be cause of thy errour. Secõdly we haue the cõsent of the whole Church, for as at this day the Church of the Catholiques, aggreeth in al points of religion, so hath it euer done, & neuer did nor could with common consent admit of any heresie, or errour in matters of faith, & religion, & therfore is called the *Piller of truth*. Thirdly we haue general Councels confirmed by the Pope, as for exãple the Councel of Trent, where the grauitie, autoritie, learning & sanctitie of the Church was assembled, which (although by scripture we were not warrãted of their autoritie in

Ephes.
Melchior Canus l. 7. de locis Theol.

1. Tim. 3.

in al ſenſe and reaſon, we ſhould rather harken, then to any priuate ſpirit. So that we rely not only on the Pope. Secondly I anſwer that we haue more aſſurance of the Popes ſpirit, then of our owne, or any particular mans ſpirit in the world. For although ſome are of opinion that the Pope as a perticular perſon may be an heretike, yea although that ſome alſo affirme, that as a publike perſon, he may erre. Vnles he vſe the counſail of a general Councel: yet more probable it is, that though he vſe but his owne ordinarie Councel, he can not erre, in matters of faith, when he defineth & cõmandeth al to ſtand to his iudgement. Becauſe as I wil proue in the ſixt chapter of this booke, he is the ſucceſſour to S. Peter, to whom, as to his Vicegerent, Chriſt promiſed to geue the keyes of opening: and to builde his Church on him, as on a ſure rorcke: yea for him, and conſequently for his ſucceſſour (becauſe the Church hath now as much nede of a ſure viſible head and paſtour, as then) Chriſt prayed that he might not erre, and ſo we haue more aſſurance of his ſpirit, eſpecially when he defineth as a publike perſon, then of any other particular & priuate ſpirit, though he be otherwiſe more learned & more holy alſo then the pope is. And ſo it is a reaſonable thing, to rely on the Popes ſpirit, becauſe he is a publike perſon, and to him as ſupreme paſtour of the church an infallible aſſiſtãce is promiſed, which warrant we haue not of anie other particular or priuate ſpirit.

Epheſ. 4. Mat. 23. Mar. 5. Ioa. 21. Eraſmus. in Schol. in ep. Hiero. ad Dam. Occham an Deus poteſt errare. Gerſon 1 part. de poteſt. Dei. Almain. tract. de pot. Dei. Adrian. in 4 Mat 16. Luc. 22.

6 But what aſſured ſtay may be had of a priuate ſpirit, we ſhal ſee none. Now I wil put a difference herin betwixt theſe ſpiritual men, & that abſurd heretike Suenkfeldius, leaſt I ſeeme to do iniurie to my aduerſarie, and not to be able to ouercome him, vnleſſe I bely him. Suenkfeldius therfore denieth al Sacraments and ſcripture, and is ſo ſpiritual, that he wil liue only of the ſpirit, and nether of the worde, nor Sacraments. But Luther and Caluin admit, both Sacraments and the worde of ſcripture, mary yet they wil haue the ſpirit to giue ſentence of ſcripture, and the meaning of ſcripture. For if you aske them how they know, that fayth only iuſtifieth? they wil anſwer, by ſcripture. But aske them how they know that which they alleage for that opinion, to be ſcripture, or that to be the true meaning of ſcripture, in which they take the ſcriptures by them alleaged? They wil not ſay, that by the Fathers, Councells, or Church, they are aſſured, but by their own priuat ſpirit. So that although Caluin writeth againſt the Libertines, for relying only on the ſpirit, yet at laſt he falleth into the ſame labyrinth him ſelfe. for albeit he wil be iudged by ſcripture, yet ſo that his ſpirit muſt giue ſentence, vvhich is ſcripture, and vvhat is the meaning

The difference betvvixt Sueuk feldius and Luther and Caluin.

Luc. 22.

meaning therof, he pronounceth the last sentence, from which is no appeal, by his priuat spirit.

Reasons to refute the priuat Spirit. The first.

7. Against this spirit of theirs I could bring many arguments, but of it self it is so phantastical, that these few shal suffice to refute it. First I say, that although God might haue gouerned his Church by interual reuelation of a priuate spirit, which should propose vnto euery one in particular, which is Scripture, & what is the meaning therof, which is true fayth, what is the wil of God, which is the way to saluation, and what are the commandements: neuertheles this were a gouernmēt rather for Angels then for men. For men are visible and haue a visible conuersation, and therfore are to be directed by visible pastours, visible lawes, and rules, and not by an inuisible spirit. For this cause almightie God, who could sanctifie vs as he doth the Angels, without any visible meanes, yet becausewe are men, he hath alwaies bestowed his graces vpon vs, by sensible signes, & sacraments, and hy a visible dispensation of men. Secondly suppose God should gouerne euerie one by his inward spirit, yet this were not sufficient for others, amongst whom we conuerse: for how shal they know my spirit to be of God, and not of the diuel? Wherfore this spirit is not sufficient to gouerne and direct men in a peaceable conuersation: becausewhilest euery man would brag of his spirit, and none could proue the same vnto others, no more then our spirites in England can: they would fal together by the eares about their spirits, & neuer should be able to part the fray, ot to end the controuersie.

A visible gouernment is necessarie for men.

The second. It is not sufficient to satisfie others.

The third. It is not sufficiēt for a mās owne selfe.

Thirdly neither is this spirit vnles it be ioined with a plaine reuelatiō (as out spiritual heretikes see by experience that it is not) sufficient for a mans owne selfe to rely on, for the assuraunce & quietnes of his conscience. For I ask of him that thinks him self most assured, how he knoweth that his spirit is of God & not of the diuel? If he answere, that the spirit bringeth with it, a certain firme persuasion, which maketh man to his thinking, assured: I say that this is not sufficient, becausе euerie heretike, yea euery Turk hath this inward persuasion & Suenkfeldius, who denyed al Sacraments and Scriptures, and would be guided only by the spirit, vvas fully thus persuaded by his spirit, which he also did verily think to be of God. If these men thought verily that they had the spirit of God, and yet were deceaued: why may not Caluin, why may not euerie brother, begin to doubt of his spirit? Yet why should we beleeue him on his bare word, to haue the true spirit, vnles he can proue it by miracles, or the authoritie of the Church, to

whom

whom Christ promised this spirit, which he can neuer do. For as for miracles he neuer could rayse a dead lowse from death to life, and to proue his spirit, by the authoritie of the Church, were to proue it conformable to the common spirit of the Christian Church, which he neither can, nor wil do, because he wil be singular. If he proue his spirit by the Scripture he windes him self in a circle, out of which he can neuer get him selfe with honour or honestie. For euen nowe he proued Scripture and the meaning therof by his spirit, and now he proueth his spirit by the Scripture, and if you aske again how he knoweth this to be Scripture, he wil answer, by his spirit, and so wil neuer get out of this circle, but wil stil proue Scripture by his spirit & his spirit, by Scripture, for which kinde of argument the Logicians, wil deride him, & hisse him out of the scoole. For to proue scripture by the spirit, and the spirit by Scripture, when Scripture according to Caluin is not knowen but by the spirit, is to proue the spirit by the spirit, and *idem*, per *idem*. But behold I pray you to what the diuel can persuade man, when he hath blinded his eyes, by depriuing him of the light of fayth. There is nothing so secret vnto man, as is this spirit: because the hart of man is a bottomeles pit, whose depth a mans owne self can not sound, it is a labyrinth into which when you enter, you can hardly finde the way to get out, spirites also are diuerse, & want not in mans hart, places to shrowd and means to tranforme them selues: They wil often tymes make a shew of the spirit of God, when in dede they are the spirit of the deuil, who long since promised that he would be *a lying spirit in the mouths of al false prophets*: and yet every brother of the new religion, warranted neither by miracle, nor euident reuelation, nor Church, nor Councel, wil nedes be persuaded, yea and assured also, that his spirit is of God. Fourthly God had bene vnreasonable, if he had giuen vs no other iudge to interpret his lawes, then this secret spirit. For he hath bound vs to a religion which is aboue reason, and often tymes against sense and sensualitie, and this he hath deliuered vnto vs in a booke very obscure and harde to vndestand, and withal he hath obliged vs to the beleef, and obseruation of this lavv and religion, vnder paine of eternal damnation. Now he hath giuen vs no other interpreter of this lawe but our owne priuat spirit, which is so subiect to errour, that he should seme to haue intended and desired our damnation, & to haue giuen vs a lavve not for a rule to direct vs, but for a snare to catch vs, & a pitfal to ruinate vs, because we can not kepe this lawe vnles we vnderstand it, and not keeping it we shal bedamned. Truly better

Ioa. 14. 15. no Heretike can proue his spirit to be of God.

Caluin casteth himselfe into a circle.

3. Reg. 22.

The fourth reason. For God to rule vs by a priuat spirit were vnreasonable.

had princes prouided for their ſubiectes, then God for his, becauſe princes make plain lawes, and yet leſt the ſubiectes ſhould plead ignoraunce, or complain that they are puniſhed for not keeping a lawe vvhich they vnderſtand not, they haue prouided interpreters whoſe gloſſes are playne: and yet Chriſt our lawegiuer according vnto Caluins opinion, hath giuen vs an obſcure lavve, and a more obſcure interpreter, to wit, the ſecret and vncertaine ſpirit, and with alexacteth hel paines of vs, if we obſerue not his lawe, in the right ſence and meaning. Fiftly if this priuate ſpirit be admitted for an vmpier in mat-

The fift reaſon.

ters of religion, al Hierarchie and order in the Church falleth: for then al are heades, none are fete, al are eyes to direct, none are inferiour members to be directed, al are paſtors, nos ſhepe, al are maſters, no ſchollars. Away then with Biſhops, yea and ſuperintendents alſo: auaunte preachers, we are not tyed to any mens ſpirit in particular, no not to the Churches ſpirit in general, becauſe euery man is

This ſpirit taketh avvay al order and Hierarchie.

Theodidactos taught of God immediatly by his priuat ſpirit. It is not true vvhich S. Paule ſayth, that Chriſt *gaue vs ſome paſtors ſome doctors*, becauſe

Epheſ. 4.

al are paſtors: It is not true that the Scripture affirmeth in many places which ſhal herafter be alleaged, that the gouernment of the Church is monarchical, no nor Ariſtocratical, but rather Democratical and populare, becauſe euery one of the people by his priuate ſpirit, is ſupreme iudge, and a ſupreme head in matters of religion, euery cobler or tinker, if he be a faithful beleeuer, iudgeth al and acknowledgeth no ſuperior: becauſe whileſt his ſpirit iudgeth vvhich is Scripture, and what is the meaning of Scripture, to vvhich al are ſubiect, he ſummoneth al to ſtand to his iudgement, and he wil be adiudged by none: and ſo vvhileſt al are ſuperiors, none are inferiors, yea none are ſuperiors, becauſe a ſuperior can not be without an inferior, and where is no ſuperior nor inferior, there is no ſubordination, where is no ſubordination, there is no order, there is confuſion, and ſo

Mat. 5. & 13.

where the ſpirit ruleth, there can not be the true church, which is co-

Dan. 2.

pared to a citie, and to a kingdome alſo, in both vvhich is a ſemely order. The Sixt is, that this opinion is againſt al Councels and practiſe of the Church. For in the firſt Councel of the Apoſtles nothing was

Act. 15.

done by the priuat ſpirit, but by common conſent of the Apoſtles and great inquiſition: and the like was the practiſe in the firſt foure general Councels, which our aduerſaries wil ſeme to receiue, & in the reſt. Yea if the priuate ſpirit be a ſufficient rule of religion, in vain hitherto haue bene al conferences, diſputations, Schooles of diuini-

tie, and

tie, and Councels alſo, both general and particular. Laſtly this ſpirit openeth the vvay vnto al heretikes and hereſies, vvhich according to my promiſe, I ſhal proue euidently, and lay open maniſtly. For if that be true ſenſe of Scripture, vvhich the priuat ſpirit ſuggeſteth, if the reformed new religion be the ſincere religion, becauſe it is ſquared and ruled by Scripture, or rather by Scripture interpreted by the priuat ſpirit, hen certainly by the ſame way, that this pretended religion is entered into the world for currant, may al heretikes and hereſies, al falſe prophetes and falſe apoſtles, claime frie paſſage alſo, and by no equitie can be excluded, if Luther, Caluin and their brotherhood be admitted. For euery lying prophet can alleage Scripture as wel as they, he can bragge of his ſpirit as we las they, he can ſay and ſweare alſo, that he hath the right ſpirit as we las they: and ſeing that the reformers of this age can ſay no more (for they haue neither miracles, nor other authoritie, to proue their ſpirit, as already is proued) it foloweth euidently, that if they be admitted and receiued, no falſe prophet, though neuer ſo phantaſtical, can be reiected.

The laſt reaſon is, that this ſpirit openeth the vvay to al heretikes.

The Concluſion.

The fourth Chapter demonſtrateth, that in reiecting Fathers and Councels, vvhich conſiſt of Fathers, the pretended reformers open the gate, to al heretikes and hereſies.

PARRICIDE, and murder of parents, in old tyme was deemed ſo hainous an offence, & ſo vnworthy a fact (as being not only contrarie to reaſon, but alſo repugnant to nature) that Solon the famouſe lavv-maker decreed no lavv againſt it: not for that he thought it not vvorthy puniſhment, but becauſe he counted it more barbarouſe, and inhumain, then could be by man committed. And in dede mans nature ſo much abhorred this vnnatural fact, that vntil ſix hundred yeares after Rome vvas built, no man euer is read of, ſo vnkinde, as vvho could find in his hart, to imbrevv his handes in his parentes bloud. Lucius Oſtius, as ſome do think, was the firſt who laying aſide al humanitie, againſt natures propenſion and natural affection, layed violent hands vpon his father, & depriued him of being, of vvhom he had receiued being. Which fact vvas no ſoonea cõmitted

Cicero. orat. pro Sexto Roſcio Amerino.

VVhy Solon made no lavv againſt Parricide.

Plut. in vita Romuli.

but nature abhorred it & the Romaines the most ciuil people, to represent the enormitie of the offence, deuised a punishment, which should not only be a iust paine, but also an Embleme of the fault. They decreed first of al, that the murderer should be sowed vp in a lether sack Secondly that sacked, he should be cast into the water. Thirdly with him were included a cock, a viper, an ape, and a dogge, to accompanie him at his death, whose natures he had imitated in his life. He was inclosed in a sack and cast into the riuer, that so at one time, he should lose the light of the sunne, which he could not see; the vse of the fyer, which he could not feele, of the aire, in which he was not permitted to breath, of the water in which he swimming was not refreshed, of the earth which he touched not: and so he was depriued at one time the of benefit of the sunne, and fowre elementes, of which al were produced, because he had bene vnkind & vnnatural to him, of whom he was begotten. His companiõs at his death were a Cocke, because as this byrd fighteh with his sire, so he hath bene iniuriouse to him that begotte him: A viper, because as this beast eateth him selfe out of his dammes belly, so he ruineth him who gaue him being, an ape, because as he imitateth man in his actions, and somewhat resembleth him in forme of bodie, yet is in dede no man, bus a beast: Fo this vnnatural murderer, caryeth the shape of a man, but in conditions is no man, because he hath cast of al humanitie. And lastly a dog, because this creaturs faythful seruice to his master, who only fedde him, may confound this monster, and condemne his treacherie, who hath bene so false to his parent, that not only fed him, but also begot him.

Cic. supra. Iuuen. Satyr. 8.

The punishment of parricides.

2. This kind of death some men haue thought not vnfit for heretikes, especially the most malicious, for with them who erre not of malice, al men wish more gentle dealing, but Arch-heretikes are so vnnatural children to Christ their father, as shal appeare in the third booke, and so vnkind to the Catholique Church their mother, which by the Sacrament of Baptisme regenerated them, and gaue them spiritual being, and do so reuile & miscal the ancient Fathers, of whom they receiued fayth & religion, that they deserue to be depriued at one time, of the heauens and elementes, of which al things are in some sorte produced, who contemne the Church, the Councels, the Fathers, & chief Pastors, of whom & by whom, they receiued their supernatural being, by which they are Christianes. They deserue a cock at their death, because as the cocke fighteth often times with his sire, & abuseth the henne that hatched him, so they contend with ancient Fathers, and as much

A punishmẽt not vnfit for Arch-heretikes.

much as in them lyeth deflower their mother the Church, which bare them spiritualy; a viper also ought to dye with thē, because like vipers by schismes & heresies, they eate them selues out of the wombe of the Church: an ape must also suffer with them, because as he resēbleth man but is in deede a beast, so they like apes imitate true Christians, bearing the name of Christ, admitting certayne Scriptures and Sacramentes as they do, deuising superintendentes for the Bishops of the Church, ministers for Priestes, tables for Altars, & a prophane Cene & supper, for the sacred Eucharist. And yet in dede are no true christianes but monstrouse infidels & worse then Iewes & Paganes: a dogge also, to make vp the number, they worthily deserue, to put them in mind, that dogges may teach them fidelitie. For dogges though they receiue sometimes blowes, & commonly no greater benefit, then crustes and bones, yet are so faythful to their masters, that they wil not leaue them to death. Wheras the Arch-heretike is so vngratful & vnfaithful to Christ, & his spouse the Church, that for no other cause then an itching humour of pride, and selfloue, he wil become a Sectmaster, that can only drop a few textes of Scripture, interpreted by his owne spirit, leauing the Church and ancient Fathers, and consequently Christ himselfe, because they euer went together, and who heareth one, heareth the other. But lest I condemne them to the punishment of parricides or contempt of ancient Fathers, before I proue them to be guiltie of the fault, I wil set downe some of their owne sayings by, which shal appeare, what respect they beare, and what kindnes they shew, towards their ancient forfathers.

Heretikes vvorse then Ievves and Paganes. Th 2. 2 q. 10. ar. 6.

Luc. 10.

Heretikes contempt of Fathers.

3 Basilides an infamous heretike, vaunted that he and his only knew the truth, and that al his forfathers were *sues & canes, hogges and dogges*, not worthie the margarites of his doctrine. The Valentinians (sayeth Ireneus) if you vrge them with Scriptures, vvhich they can not answer, wil denie them: if you prouoke them to be tryed by tradition, deliuered vnto vs by a succession of Priestes and Fathers, *aduersantur traditioni, dicentes: se non solum Presbyteris, sed etiam Apostolis existentes sapientiores, sinceram inuenisse veritatem: they oppose against traditions saying that they being vviser then the Priests and Apostles, haue found out the sincere veritie.* Arius as before I haue rehearsed, thought none of the Fathers comparable vnto him. Nestorius disdained to read their works. And our reformers of this age, shew by their vnreuerent, and rayling speaches against the Fathers, that they are descended of the same race of parricides, and reuilers of their ancient fathers.

Ex Epip. her. Basilides contemned Fathers.

Li. 3. c. 2. So did the Valentinians

So did Arius and Nestorius chap. 5.

Luther no lesse contemneth fathers.

4 To beginne therfore with the first patriarch of this new religion, Martin Luther, that man not of God (for by his owne cõfession he was so familiar vvith the diuel, that he did eate a bu shel of salt vvith him) in his booke against the king of England, hauing called him blokhead, beetlehead, grosse head, dul pate, and such like names, for pressing him with the authoritie of Fathers, thus he decideth the matter: *Henricus dicta patrũ inducit pro sacrificio missario, &c. Henrie for his massing sacrifice bringeth in the sayinges of Fathers. Here say I, that by this meanes, my sentence is confirmed: for this is it vvhich I sayed, that the Thomistical asses, haue nothing vvhich they can alleage but a multitude of men, and the ancient vse. But I against the sayings of fathers, men, angels, and diuels, put dovvne the Gospel, vvhich is the vvorde of the æternal majestie: here I insult ouer the saings of men, though neuer so holy, so that I care not though a thousand Austines, and Ciprianes, should stand against me.* And in an other place hauing reiected Fathers, Councels Scooles and ages, he thus concludeth. *Neither let the multitude, magnitude, latitude, profunditie, miracles, saintitie of the Church, of Saintes moue thee a iote, al of them vvere damned, if they thought as they vvrit.* Thus one Martin Luther braueth them al, & thus this good child reuerenceth, and respecteth his ancient Fathers: for, as I sayed in the last chapter, although he seemeth only to preferre the Scripture, yet seing that they admitted, and alleaged Scripture also, the question is, who hath better skil in expounding Scripture, and if we beleeue this man, al the Fathers might haue gone to schoole to him. Zuinglius wil not be behind Luther in this matter. *They affirme* (sayeth he) *and vve deny, that the masse is a sacrifice. Vvho shal be iudge of this controuersie? The sole,* say I, *and the only vvord of God. But by and by thou beginnest to crye, The Fathers, the Fathers haue thus deliuered vnto vs. But I bring to thee not Fathers, nor mothers, but I require the vvord of God.* Caluine desireth to be counted modest, but herein also he could not conteine him self. *Vvhen the aduersaries obiect to me* (sayeth he) *that this vvas the custome, I answvere that the old Fathers in this matter vvanted both lavv and example, & vvere caryed avvay into errour, vvhilest they attributed too much to the name of pœnaunce, and the common peoples opinions. And again: I am litle moued vvith those things vvhich occurre euery vvhere, in the vvritings of Fathers concerning satisfaction. I see truly many of them yea (I vvil speake simply as it is) almost al of them, vvhose bookes are extant, vvere in this matter deceiued, and spoke hardly.* And in an other booke of his, he calleth the Fathers of the councel of Trent *hogges & asses.* Peter martyr calleth Papistes Patrologos, not Theologos, for alleaging Fathers. Doctor Humphrey in the life of Iewel, perceiuing that Iewel had offered to much

l. 2. cont. Reg. Angl. f. 348.

Li. de Seruo. Arbitr. apud steph in defen. Apol.

In expos. ar. 64. fol. 178.

Zuinglius not behind Luther.

Caluin yeeldeth not vnto them.

l. 3. Inst. ca. 3. n. 10.

c. 6. n. 11.

in Antid. can 3.

l. de votis.

Peter Martyr.

vvhen in his ſermon, he was content to be tryed by Fathers, ſayeth, that he might haue vſed a better defence for him ſelfe, then the authoritie of Fathers! *Vvho* (ſayeth he) *if they teach contrarie, it litle skilleth. For vvhat haue vve to do vvith Fathers, vvith flesh & bloud, or vvhat perteineth it to vs, vvhat the false Synods of Bishops do decree?* Beza calleth Athanaſius Sanaſius, and the Fathers of the Nicen Councel, blind ſophiſters, miniſters of the beaſt, and ſlaues of Antichriſt. And although Luther affirmeth that S Gregorie the great, vvas a good Pope, yet Bibliander calleth him in deriſion, the Patriarch of ceremonies. Melancthon condemneth him, for allovving of the Sacrifice of the maſſe for the dead. Paulus Vergerius vvrote a booke of the toyes and fables of Gregorie. Horne in his booke againſt Abbot Fecnam, calleth this ſaint (to vvhom we Enghiſh men owe no leſſe then our conuerſion from paganiſme to chriſtianitie) a blind buſſard. Bale the cronicler ſayeth, that this Saint, ſent Auſtin the monke to plante in England his Romiſh religion, but yet (ſayeth he) Latimer is much more worthy to be counted Englands Apoſtle, becauſe Auſtine brought nothing but mans traditions, maſſe, croſſes, letanies, vvheras Latimer with the hooke of truth cut of theſe ſuperſtitions. Whitaker in his booke of reprehenſion ſayeth, that the Fathers for the moſt part were of opinion that Antichriſt is but one particular man, but in that as in many other things they erred. The like reſpect they beare to general Councels, in vvhich the wiſeſt and graueſt Fathers of the Church vvere alvvayes aſſembled. Luther in his booke of Councels calleth them Sicophants, and flaterers of the Pope, and ſayeth, that the Canons of the Councel of Nice, vvhich Conſtantine reuerenced and honoured with his preſence, are *hay, ſtrovv, ſtickes, and ſtuble.* Yea in this Councel he findeth a plaine contradiction, as he thinketh, becauſe the Councel forbideth al Eunuches to be promoted to Prieſthood, and yet commandeth Prieſtes to liue chaſtly. As though only they vvho are gelded could liue chaſt, and as though there were no meane betwixt wiuing, and gelding. Yea ſayeth Luther, if al the decrees of Councels vvere povvred into thee with a pipe, yet vvould they not make thee a chriſtian. Caluin vvil examine al Councels by the vvord, before he wil giue any credit vnto them, and ſeing that the Faters in Councels examined their decrees by Scripture alſo, Caluin wil make an examination vpon their examination, and ſo vvil be Iudge of them al. But leſt I vveary the reader with to long a catalogue of reuiling ſpeaches of theſe contumelious Chammes and parricides, I report me vnto the indifferent reader,

Doctor Humphredey. Vide eundem in præfat in Orig. Beza. l. cont. Papatum. Bibliander prefat. ep. Zuing. & Oecolũpadus. Melancthon. l. 4. chron. in Hear. 4. P. Vergerius. Horne. Cent. 3. pag 66. 72. Cent. 8. pag. 678. VVhitaker. Heretikes contemne Councels. Luther. Ibidem. l. cont. Regem Anglia. l. 4. Inſt c. 3. ſect. 3. Caluin.

reader, vvhether they deserue not the punishment of parricides, who so scoffe, taunt, contemne, and reuile their forfathers. But my meaning was not to condemne them, vpon whom God his sentence must passe, my drift is herby to shew, how much in reuiling Fathers they crack the credit of their religion, & how withal in reiecting this authoritie, they open the gap to al heretikes and heresies. And as concerning the first point, it is wel knowne, that antiquitie was alwayes reuerenced: old age vvas euer respected, old coynes priced, ancient statues admired, old vvriting estemed, & in al artes, the most ancient professors of the same, beare the bel away. In painting Appelles hath the credit aboue al painters, in statuarie works Lycippus: in comedies Plautus & Terence, in Tragedies Seneca: in histories Liuie, Salust, Iustine: in Poetrie, Homer, Virgil, Ouid: in Rhetorick Demosthenes, and Cicero: in Philosophie, Plato, & Aristotle. And shal not the ancient Fathers & Doctors of the Church, vvho by their art professed exposition of Scripture, be reuerenced, and credited in their art before our vnlearned and vpstart ministers? shal antiquitie geue credit to Poetes and painters, and not to Doctors and interpreters of Scripture: What is this but to preferre prophane literature before religion, Philosophie before Faith and Diuinitie, Paganisme before Christianitie, Poetes & painters before Doctors and Fathers of the Church. If any one now should say, that Plato, and Aristotle, were but doltes and Asses, that Appelles was but a blurring painter, that Cicero vvas but a railing Rhetorician, that Virgil & Ouid, were but riming Poets, vvhose eares could abide such contumelies? Think then, indifferent reader, how fowle mouthed the heretiques of this age are; who thus miscal the ancient Fathers, renowmed for their skil in interpreting Scripture, and other learning as appeareth by their learned Commentaries Homelies, and other workes; Think kow arrogant these men are, who preferre themselues before al ancient Fathers, euen in that learning, vvhich vvas their profession, and for vvhich they haue bene for many hundreed yeares, as famouse, as euer Cirero was for eloquence, Aristotle for Philosophie, or Virgil, and Ouid, for Poetrie. But vvhilest they contemne the authoritie of ancient fathers, vvhat great authoritie do they bring, but vpstart and vnlearned ministers. Whilest they reiect the Fathers as men who might erre, are they goods or angels? are not they men as the Fathers were and not woorthie to be their men and seruantes, to cary their bookes after them:

In reiecting Fathers they cracke their credit.

Antiquitie alvvayes reuerenced.

Fathers for their antiquitie to be reuerenced.

Heretikes are fovvle mouthed.

6 But now according to my promise, I wil declare the first point by me

y me proposed, to wit, how in reiecting Fathers, they crack their wne credit. For these Fathers vvere learned, graue, wise, glorious in vorking miracles, and great in bearing of authoritie in the Church of od. Their profession was preaching, teaching & interpreting of Scripture, in which art they are ancient, and famous for many hundred eares Some of them were scholars to the Apostles, others succeeded mediatly the Apostles scholars. The new Apostles are new & yong, ho beganne but the other day to study, and to interprete Scriptures, d peraduenture many of them would neuer haue bene able to make ermon, had they not the helpe of the Fathers commentaries and omelies. Let then the indifferent reader be iudge, whether the religon vvhich the Fathers taught and professed, or that vvhich these w Apostles haue deuised, be likest to be true, and vvhether it be not ore probable, that they preached and taught according to Scripture, ther then our new and later clerkes. Truly to say that a Luther, a aluin, Zuinglius, Beza, is herin to be preferred before Austines, mbroses, Hieromes, Gregories, were much more absurdly spoken, é if one should preferre the painters of these dayes, before Appelles, the Phisitions of this age before Galen. More ouer where these Fa-ers went, there alwaies went religion, where they were Doctors, at was the Church of Christ, where they were Pastors, there vvas wayes the fold of Christ, of them consisted al the general Councels, them were the ancient Canons decreed, and old heresies condem-d, al the Bishoprikes, and Churches, by them vvere gouerned, d by their meanes erected. They were the men, who in al ages op-sed them selues against heretiques, as true Pastors against the raue-ng wolues, who had only the coate of shepheards. Against them & eir people, vvere raysed al the persecutions, as against the only Chri-anes, their actions, their offices, in Gods Chureh, their bookes, eir miracles, their liues, their deathes, do fil Ecclesiastical histories, e vvriters wherof intending to vvrite the beginning and progres of e Christian Church, writ only of the Romain and Catholique urch, Pastors and Doctors, wherof were the ancient Fathers. So at vvhilest our reformers refuse the authoritie and doctrine of the thers, they cut them selues from the Church of Christ, because that d the Fathers (as al histories and monumentes declare) went euer gether, and they ioyne in part with al old heretikes, vvhom the Fa-ers by doctrine and censure, euer condemned, because in one heresie other they agree with them al, as shal be in the next booke de-

The comparison betvvix. Fathers and ministers.

It is absurd to say: that the new preachers better vnderstand Scriptures, then the Fathres.

The Fathers & the church euer vvente together.

The reformers in reiecting Fathers cut them selues from the church.

Campian. rat. 5.

monstrated, and they let not to confesse, with Tobie Matthew, that no man can read Fathers and beleue them, and imbrace this new religion. Read Genebrard (gentle reader) and thou shalt see how in the end of euery age he setteth downe a catalogue of al the ancient Fathers, vvho were counted the only true pastors, and vvhom the Catholiques vvhich novv liue, professe to folovv (as the heretikes of this age wil confesse) also a list of al the heretikes, vvhom the reformers odore and embrace, as I shal proue hereafter in the second booke. Iudge thou then, vvhether the Church and Christian religion be with these reformers, and reuilers of Fathers, or with the Catholiques vvhom they haue nicknamed Papistes.

The Authoritie of Fathers trubled Luther.

7 This argument of the Fathers authoritie, put Luther many tymes to his shiftes, & sometimes afflicted him, with no litle scruples: but because he had a large conscience, he swallowed them vp and in time digested them al. *Hovv often* (sayeth he) *did my tremblinghart beat vvithin me, and reprehending me, obiect against me that most strong arguments? Art thou only vvise? Do so many vvorldes erre? VVere so many ages ignorant? VVhat if thou erreſt and dravvest so many into errour to be damned vvith thee eternally?* And in an other place. *Doest thou, a sole man, and of no account, take vpon thee so great matters? VVhat if thou being but one man offendest? If God permit such, so many, and al to erre, vvhy may he not permit thee to erre? Hitherto apperteyn those arguments. The Church, the Fathers, the Councels, the custome, the multitudes, and greatnes of vvise men. VVhom do not these hilles of argumentes, these thick cloudes, yea these seas of examples ouervvhelme?* And yet again this scruple assaulteh him. *Some* (sayeth he) *vvil say vnto me: The Church so many ages hath so thought and taught, so haue thought and taught al the primitiue Churches, and Doctores most holy men, much more great and more learned then thou. VVho art thou that dareſt dissent from these, and obtrude vnto vs a diuerse doctrine?* Thus God moued Luthers hart vvhich might haue bene a sufficient cal, to haue recalled and reclaimed him: but he being obstinate put this motion by thus: *VVhen satan thus vrgeth, and conspireth vvith flesh, and reason, the conscience is terrified and dispaireth. vnles constantly thou returne to thy selfe, and say, vvhether Ciprian, Ambrose, Austin, or Peter, Paule, and Iohn. yea an angel from heaueu, teach otherwise, yet this I knovv for certain, that I counsayle not men to humane but diuine things.*

Luther cā not answver the authoritie of Fathers.

Art thou sure Luther, vvhen thou hast so many, and so learned Fathers against thee? Dareſt thou preferre thy owne particular iudgement before their common consent? Yea (sayeth M. Whitakar) Luther in some case may prefer him selfe before al the Fathers, and a thousand

Tom. 4. annot. breuiss.

Præfat. l. de abrog. missa priuata.

To. 5. in Gal.

Churches

Churches. For vvhen his doctrine is according to Scripture then is it to giue place to no Fathers. But this is as much to the purpose as the parch beside the hole, becauſe the compariſon is not betwixt Fathers and Scriptures, vvhich are to be perferred. For the Fathers allowed and alleaged Scripture euen for thoſe pointes of doctrine for which Luther doth, and al the Luthers in the world can not proue that al the Fathers held any one opinion againſt Scripture; but the queſtion is vvhether Luther or al the Fathers, did beſt vnderſtand Scripture; and therfore if Luther hold gainſt the Fathers in expoſition of Scripture, he preferreth him ſelfe before them al. As for example, Luther alleageth Scripture to diſproue frie wil, al the Fathers alleage Scripture to proue it, and Luther expoundeth Scripture one way, they an other, elſe they could not both alleage Scripture for contrarie doctrine. Wherfore if Luther ſayeth that he expoundeth Scripture truly, and therfore careth not for al the Fathers, he preferreth his owne iudgement before them al, and ſo can not anſwer that argument grounded on the Fathers authoritie, nor comfort him ſelfe with this, that he forſooth hath the vvord of God, vvhich is aboue them al. And ſo Luther muſt giue vs leaue, to come vpon him with his owne argument, vvhich he ſhal neuer anſwer. The Church frō the begining hath taught & expounded Scripture otherwiſe then thou doeſt, ſo many Auſtines, Ambroſes, Ciprianes, Councels, and ages, haue preached otherwiſe. Are they al deceiued? haſt thou only found out the truth? what if thou rather art deluded? Thou art but one, they are many, thou art of late they of ancient ſtanding, thou a ſinner, they Saintes: thou ſome ſcholar, but they were learned doctors, thou haſt a witte, but al their wittes were of a greater reach, thou ſeeſt ſome thing, but ſo many eyes muſt needs haue a greater inſight; Thou haſt ſtudyed Scripture, but they more: thou haſt watched at thy booke, but they in night ſtudie haue ſpent more oyle then thou, though thou peraduenture more wine then they, and thou alleageſt Scripture for thy doctrine, they for the contrarie. And ſo their iudgement muſt be preferred before thine, and conſequently theirs ſhal be the true doctrine, they the true Paſtors, theirs the true Church; and ſo ours now is the true Chriſtian religion, we the right Chriſtianes, who agree with thoſe Fathers, and the Church of vvhich they were Paſtors and preachers: and Luther and the reformers, who wil haue no part with the Fathers, are no members of the true Church, becauſe the anciēt fathers & the true Church were neuer yet ſeperated, but alwayes went together.

see M. Reinolds in his Refut. chap. 3. pag. 47.

M. Vvhitakers anſvvere is not to the purpoſe.

Luther confoūded vvith his ovvne argument.

A compariſon of Luther and the Fathers.

In reiecting Fathers the reformers open the gappe to al heretikes.

8. The firſt point being proued, we wil come to the ſecond, in which I ſhal proue that in reiecting Fathers, they open the gap to al heretikes, who may ſay what they wil (as the reformers do) if that authoritie be contemned. But firſt it ſhal not be amiſſe to declare what authoritie the Fathers haue, & whether they haue infallible aſſiſtance of God, to expound Scriptures rigthly, for if they haue not, neither are Catholiques aſſured of their fayth by their authoritie, neither do the heretikes open the gappe to hereſies by reiecting their authoritie, which if it be not infallible, may it ſelf alſo authoriſe & countenaunce hereſie. S. Paul ſayeth, that God hath prouided vs of *ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, others Euangeliſts, others Doctors, & Paſtors, to the conſummation of Saintes, to the vvorke of the miniſterie, vnto the edifying of the body of Chriſt*, that is, for the inſtruction of his Church. Where the firſt place is geuen to Prophets, Apoſtles and Euangeliſtes, who wrote the Scripture: in the ſecond place folow Doctors & Paſtors, becauſe their office is not to write Scripture, but to interpret it. And the reaſon is yeelded, why theſe Doctors are geuen vnto vs, *leſt vve ſhould vvauer like children, & be caryed about vvith euery vvind of the doctrine of men.* Now if al the Paſtors and Doctors, which we cal Fathers, ſhould or could erre, then were they not appointed to keepe their ſhepe from wandering, rather ſhould they be the cauſe of their error, for the ſheepe muſt heare the voice of their Paſtors: and ſo if the Paſtors erre, the ſhepe muſt erre with them, if they wander, the ſheepe who know nothing but by their Paſtors, can not keepe the right way. And if thou ſay, that in caſe of error, the people muſt leaue the Paſtors, I demand of thee how they ſhal know when the Paſtors erre, who knowe nothing, but by the voice of their Paſtors? And ſuppoſe they ſhould leaue their Paſtors, then is the frame of the body of Chriſtes Church diſſolued, and the members are ſeparated from the head, and the Church is a headles body: then do they leaue the ſalt, by which they ſhould be ſalted, and preſerued from corruption in religion: Then do they leaue the light, by which they ſhould be illuminated. And how then is that true: *Vpon Moyſes chair ſit the Scribes and Phariſies: do thoſe thinges vvhich they ſay*: are the Paſtors of the Church of leſſe authoritie, then the Paſtors of the Synagogue? If they can erre, then is it not true which Chriſt ſayed: *Vvhoſoeuer heareth you, heareth me*, vnles you wil ſay, that Chriſt alſo may erre in them, and with them. But our heretikes wil ſay, that al the Fathers are men. I graunt it, but they are men directed by the Holy Ghoſt, and Chriſt was a man, & yet not only as God, but as man alſo, he could

Ephes. 4.

Ibidem.

Vve muſt not leaue of paſtours.

Matt. 5.

Matt. 19.

Luc. 10.

he could not erre. And the writers of Scripture, as Moyſes, and Salomon, and the Prophets of the old law, and the Apoſtles and Euangeliſtes in the new law were men; and yet they erred not, nor could not erre, vnles we wil cal Scripture in queſtion. But where (ſaye they) read you, that the Fathers haue the infallible aſſiſtance, in expoſition of ſcripture? Where I read, that they are light, that they are ſalt, that they are Paſtors, to whom vvhen vve harken, vve harken to Chriſt. Where I read thar vve muſt do vvhat they ſay, vvhere I read, that the Church can not erre, vvhich muſt folow her Paſtors, vvhere I read, that the Church, vvhich learneth al of her Paſtors, is a piller of truth. But ſome Fathers haue erred. I grant it, but neuer al agreed in one error together: neuer al the Fathers of al ages, yea not of one age (for to theſe alſo vve muſt harken) haue conſpired in an vntrutrh. And I demand of our reformers: VVhether they be not men alſo? And I think they vvil not deny it. If they be men, I aske vvhether they can not erre in expounding Scripture? If they can, then neither they, nor others by them haue aſſurance. If they can not erre, becauſe euery one of them hath the ſpirit, Then ſay I, that more probable it is, that ſo many ſpirits of the Fathers conſpiring in one can not erre, then that no particular & priuat ſpirit can erre, eſpecially ſeing that the priuate ſpirites are diuerſe and contrarie, and vve haue no more aſſurance of one then of an other. Iudge novv (gentle reader) whether that the Catholique religion vvhich is conformable to the Fathers, and Paſtors of the Church, be the ſincere Chriſtian religion, or rather the religion of the heretikes, which is agreable to no common, but only to a priuat ſpirit: eſpecially ſeing that vve haue ſuch vvarrant for the common conſent of Fathers, but none at al for the priuat ſpirit of euery priuate man.

The Fathers vvere men, but ſuch as could not al erre.

Proofes that the Fathers can not al erre.

Mat. 5.
Io. 21.
Mat. 13.
1. Tim. 3.

9. Novv let vs ſee in avvord hovv by reiecting this infallible authoritie of Fathers, they leaue no certain rule for expoſition of Scripture, and ſo open the vvay to al heretikes and hereſies. For lay avvay Fathers, vvhich vvere in al ages counted the only Paſtors, of the Church, the authoritie of Councels is nothing vvorth, for they conſiſted of Fathers, the authoritie of the Church is of as litle eſteeme, becauſe ſhe alvvayes beleeued, as her Paſtors did, yea ſhe could not tel vvhat to beleeue, but by their inſtruction. Scripture therfore is only left and the priuate ſpirit, & ſeing thoſe tvvo bare authorities, as before is proued, open the vvay to al hereſies, the denyal of the Fathers authoritie muſt needs do the ſame. For ſuppoſe a nevv heretike, yea a

Hovv by reiecting Fathers, the gap is open to al heretikes.

Yea to the diuel.

diuel from hel in the likenes of a man, ſhould preach a newv hereſie, contrarie to the hereſies that euer vvere, might he not alleage Scripture for it, expounding it as he pleaſeth? And if you demand of him how he knovveth that he expoundeth it aright, might he not ſay, that his ſpirit telleth him ſo? And if you alleage that al that euer taught before him vvere of an other opinion, and gaue an other expoſition of Scripture: might he not ſay, as eaſily as Luther and Caluin do, that they vvere men, & erred al the packe of them? And ſo if authoritie of Fathers be reiected, he or any other might ſay, vvhat he vvould, and no man could controle him. Wherfore to conclude, if we giue eare vnto the Goſpellers of this tyme, who haue reiected the authoritie of Fathers, & wil conſequently iudge al by Scripture, ſenſed by the priuate ſpirit, vve muſt harken to al heretikes, and open a gap and make way to al falſe Apoſtles, who can not without manifeſt partialitie, be excluded and repelled, if theſe men be admitted.

The conclusion.

The fift chapter shevveth, that they haue no probable meanes, to induce a reaſonable man vnto their religion, and that therfore, if vve giue credit vnto them, vve muſt geue credit to al heretikes, preach they neuer ſo abſurd, & phantaſtical paradoxes.

Our faith is aboue reaſon, yet credible and not vnreaſonable.

IT is a common opinion amongſt the ancient Fathers and Diuines, that our Fayth being ſupernatural, can nor be demonſtrated by reaſon, as opinions of Philoſophers may be, becauſe it aymeth at thinges aboue reaſon. Philoſophie ſoaring no higher, then reaſon geueth her leaue, and ſo in Chriſtian religion, vve ought more to rely on fayth, and authoritie, then reaſon: and we can not ſhew our ſelues more reaſonable, then to leaue of reaſoning in thinges aboue reaſon. But although it be ſo, that we can not proue our religion by reaſon, yet we may ſet it forth with ſuch teſtimonie of miracles, antiquitie, common conſent, and ſuch like motiues, as ſhal conuince a man of reaſon, that this religion inuolueth no abſurditie againſt reaſon, but rather is very probable, and moſt credibly to be beleeued. For although, as S. Thomas ſayth, our religion be not euidently true, yet is it *euidenter credibilis, euidently credible.* For though in it ſelfe

2.2.q.1.a.6.

it ſelfe it be obſcure, yet hath it bene ſo credible deliuered vnto vs, by credible ſignes & tokēs, that no man can with reaſon thinke it otherwiſe, then very credidle, if he wel conſider, what teſtimonies may be alleaged for it; vvhich, as Dauid ſayed, are *credibilia nimis*, *very credible*, that is ſo credible, as we can not vvith reaſon deſire greater teſtimonie, for things aboue reaſon.

Faith is euidently credible.

Pſal. 92.

2. In the beginning God catechiſed man in this religion, by Angels whom he ſent, and by Patriarches & Prophetes whom he inſpired, by whom he taught the people, what Sacramentes to vſe, what Sacrifices to offer, and other pointes of Religion, ſuch as then men vvere capable of. In the lavv vvritten he deliuered his wil and meaning concerning lavv, and Religion, and the Ceremonies, and Sacraments belonging thervnto, by his ſeruant Moyſes, to whom he appeared by an Angel in thundering, and other ſuch ſignes, and by whom he wrought in Ægypt, and in the deſert ſo many miracles, for proofe and confirmation of this Religion. Afterwards, in the law of grace and fulnes of tyme, and tyme of ſpiritual plenty and riches, as in more ample manner, ſo with greater teſtimonies and ſignes, this fayth vvas deliuered vnto vs. For firſt our Sauiour proued his miſſion by al the ancient Prophetes, vvho had fortold his coming, and the maner of his coming, his office, the place & circumſtances of his natiuitie, life, and death, vvhich al agreing to him concluded him to be the Meſſias. Secondly by infinite miracles he proued his authoritie & doctrine, in ſo much that he ſayed, that the vvorkes which he did, gaue teſtimonie of him, yea the Iewes cōfeſſed that he could not haue doone ſo ſtrange thinges, if he had not bene of God. And ſeing that he vvrought theſe miracles, to proue him ſelfe to be the Meſſias, & his doctrine to be of God, it could not be otherwiſe, becauſe as God can not deceiue, being *prima veritas*, *the firſt veritie*, nor be deceiued, being vviſdom it ſelfe, ſo can he not geue teſtimonie of an vntruth by miracles, for then ſhould he be both a lyer, & a deceiuer. The Apoſtles in like maner, after that in Pentecoſt they had receiued the Holy Ghoſt in viſible forme and manner, receiued power alſo to geue this Holy Spirit viſibly to others, and to worke miracles alſo, to proue their miſſion, & doctrine, in ſo much that S. Mark ſayeth, that *they preached, and God confirmed their doctrine by miracles, and ſignes that folovved*. Wherfore although the doctrine which they preached vvas out of reaſons kenning, yet it vvas made euident by teſtimonie, and ſo vvas euidently credible, becauſe if God can not geue teſtimonie to an vntruth, then in that

In the lavve of nature vve receued religion from Angels, and Patriarchs.

In the lavve vvritten religion vvas taught by Moyſes, firſt taught by Angels

In the lavve of grace by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles.

Io. 9. & 10.

God can not geue teſtimonie of an vntruth by miracles.

Act. 2.

Mar. vlt.

Hovv faith is euidently credible.

in that he gaue testimonie by miracle of their doctrine, it must neder folow that it was of God.

The strange planting of our faith proueth our religion.

Iosue 6.

A fit similitude.

3 Secondly the strange conqueſt vvhich the Apoſtles made of Idolatrie, in deſpite of al the Philophers, and Tyrants of the world, and the miraculous planting of the Christian fayth, is an argument to proue our religion to be of God, most pregnāt, & a motiue to perſwade any reaſonable man, most forcible. For as once the Israelites by making a Proceſſion about the walles of Hierico, and ſounding of their trumpets (an vnlikely ſtratageme to ſurpriſe ſuch a citie) diſmantled the towne and leueled the walles with the ground: ſo Christ Ieſus by the circuit of a few Apoſtles and diſciples, about the world, and by the blaſtes of their mouthes, which were the golden trumpets, that promulgated the new law, ranſaked the citie of Idolatrie, that then was as great almoſt as the world, made the Romain Empire ſubiect to Christes Church, and cauſed the Scepter to yeeld to Christes Croſſe, & made Philoſopie as an handmayd, to ſerue and attend vpon the fayth of Christ.

The Conqueſt vvhich the Apoſtles made of Idolatrie vvas ſtrange First in reſpect of the Souldiars vvhich vvere vveake.

4 A ſtrange conqueſt certes, whether you conſider the warryers, or the maner of fight, or the force of the enemie, againſt vvhom they waged battayle. For as concerning the ſouldiars, good Lord hovv vnlikely men, to atcheue ſuch a victorie! Warriers ſhould be men of force and ſtrength to make the aſſault, and to giue the onſet, to defend or offend. Theſe were feeble fiſhers. *Infirma mundi elegit Deus: God choſe the vveakelings of this vvorld.* Warryers eſpecially the King or General, ſhould haue riches and treaſures good ſtore, becauſe armies can neither be leuied nor releeued without money, vvhich therfore is called, *nervus belli, the ſinevv or ſtrength of vvarre.* Theſe men vvere poore fiſhers,

1. Cor. 1.

Poore.

who had no other treaſure then ragged nettes, and their General Chriſt Ieſus, vvas as poore as they, liuing on almes, & not hauing ſometimes that vvhich vvolues and wilde beaſtes haue, a chamber to lodge in.

Luc. 9.

Warriers, eſpecially if they be the leaders, muſt be of noble birth, and parentage: for ſouldiars be hardly led by them, who are baſe, and not eaſily commanded by them, vvho are as meane in qualitie and condition as them ſelues. Theſe men were fiſher men, the baſeſt kind of people, if we beleeue Plutarch, that are to be found: who therfore by their trade are baniſhed humain ſocietie, & conuerſe more with fiſhes then men, and liue more on the water then on the land.

Baſe.

1. Cor. 1.

Ignobilia & contemptibilia huius mundi elegit Deus: God hath choſen the ignoble and contemptible of this vvorld. Warriers ſhould be wiſe and ingenious to lay plottes,

to deuiſe

o deuiſe ſtratagemes, and to vſe force of wit, where force of armes wil not ſerue. Theſe vvere ſimple fiſhermen, neuer trayned vp in ſchooles, and more cunning with a hooke, then vvith a booke: *ſtulta huius mundi elegit Deus: God choſe the foolish of this vvorld.* Souldiars ſhould be many in number leſt the groſſe troupes of the aduerſarie terrifie them, vvith the ſight of the multitude: Theſe were a ſmal army, and a ſilly flocke, only tvvelue Capitaines, the tvvelue Apoſtles, and 72. priuat ſouldiars, I meane ſeauentie tvvo Diſciples. And yet theſe vveakelings, were to vvraſtle with the might of the Romain Empire, Theſe poore beggers vvere to deale vvith them that had the vvelth of the vvorld. Theſe baſe fiſhers vvere to contend vvith the nobilitie of the vvorld. Theſe ſimple ſoules vvere to encounter vvith the vviſeſt Philoſophers. And theſe few waged battayle againſt al nations vpon earth, yea al the diuels in hel, vvho alſo oppoſed againſt them al their hellish forces.

Simple.

1. Cor. 1.

Fevve.

Luc. 12.

The force of the aduerſarie.

5. And as touching the maner of the fight, it made the victorie more incredible. For the enemies came vvith the floriſh of eloquence, theſe vvith halfe barbarouſe ſimplicitie: they came armed vvith povver, theſe vvith infirmitie, *in vvhich vertue is perfited*: they vvith pride, theſe vvith humilitie: *they ſhot maledictions, theſe benedictions:* They layed on blovves, theſe boare them patiently: they cried, Kil kil, theſe cryed, Suffer, ſuffer. A ſtrange maner of figt, vvhere the ſouldiars ouercame, by putting vp iniuries, not by reuenging, by bearing not by geuing blowes, by laying the body open to the enemyes vveapon, not by cloſſe vvarding or defending. But if theſe few ſouldiars ſo il armed, might haue kept together, they had bene more ſtrong, becauſe force vnited, is greater then the ſame diſperſed, but theſe few ſouldiars diuided forces, and one man ſingle vvent againſt a vvhole countrie, yea ſometimes many Countries. S. Peter ſetteth vpon Ponrus, Bithinia, Galatia, and Rome it ſelfe. S. Paul goeth againſt Illiricus, Cappadocia, Ciprus, S. Iames the elder encounreth with al Spaine. S. Iames the younger with Iurie: S. Thomas with India, S. Matthevv vvith Æthiopia, others vvith other countries, And in fine, thus they conquered the greateſt part of the world.

Secondly the Conqueſt was ſtrange in reſpect of the maner.

2. Cor. 12.

1. Cor. 4.

Force vnited is greater.

One apoſtle ſetteth vpon a vvhole countrie.

The places to vvhich the Apoſtle were ſent eſpecially.

6. Now if vve conſider in vvhat conſiſted the victorie, it vvil yet appeare more admirable. This victorie conſiſted not in ſurpriſing of a citie, in vndermining a caſtle, in burning of villages, in gayning of rauelings, in maiming and killing bodyes, but in extinguiſhing of

Thirdly in The thing.

idolatrie, in extirpating vice, in subdewing mens vnderstanding, in ouercomming their willes, in curbing & bridling their affections, in planting a new religion, neuer heard of before, which commandeth men to beleue firmely things aboue reason, and to obserue lawes contrarie to sensualitie, vice and pleasure, which by long custome were become almost natural vnto men. And to this they perswaded not a few, but al the world, not fooles but Philosophers, such as Dionisius Areopagita, Iustinus martyr, and others were: not poore men, but Kings, yea and Emperours, such as Philip, and Constantine were, and that in despite of the tyrants in earth, and maugre al the deuils in hel. Yea so firmely they perswaded men vnto this new religion, and new life, that thousandes by and by were ready to suffer al torments, rather then to deny the least article of this new beleefe. Let not any therfore obiect vnto vs, that our Religion is obscure, and that it teacheth thinges aboue reason. For although vve can not by reason see the truth, nor proue the truth of religion, yet it can not but be true and of God, because such men as the Apostles were. to such as al the world but they were (that is nusled and perswaded in a contrarie religion) and after so strange a maner, could neuer haue planted so hard a Religion, and that in despite of the Tyrants in earth, and diuels in hel, vnles God had both set them on, and assisted them.

Vvhom the Apostles vanquished.

Hovv firmly they perswaded men to religion.

Our religion can not but be of God.

Read S. Aust. in the 22 booke of the Citie of God. c. v.

7. Let not then the Atheists of this godles tyme, cal in question the miracles of Christ, and his Saintes, vvrought by them in confirmation of this Religion, & related in the Scripture, & Ecclesiastical Histories, as though they were but old wiues tales, which they tell amongst their maides. Let them not say that neuer miracle was wrought for this religion, by this they shal gaine nothing, I will come vpon them vvith that of S. Austine, that such a religion by such & in such a maner should be planted in the vvorld vvithout miracles is the greatest miracle of al, and so in denying miracles, wil they, nil they, they graunt a miracle. Deny if thou vvilt our miracles (for vvhich notwithstanding we haue as good, & better histories, then thou hast for the Romain Emperours, Captaynes, Legions, vvarres, & victories) thou canst not deny, but that a few fishermen, obscure, meane, vnlearned, haue turned al the vvorld vpside downe, for this thou seest. Thou canst not deny but that the vvorld is dissvvaded from idolatrie vnto Christianitie, from sensualitie to chastitie, from gluttony to fasting, from riches to voluntarie pouertie, from vsual vice to vnacquainted vertue, from the broad & easy vvay vvhich leadeth to perdition vnto

Against the Atheistes vvho deny miracles.

l. 22. ciuit. c. 5.

nto the ſtrayt and narrovv vvay, vvhich tendeth to ſaluation. Thou anſt not deny, but that men vnlearned, and impotent, haue done his, vvhom thou canſt ſuſpect neither to haue vſed deceit, not compulſion. Thou canſt not deny, but that many Emperors haue reſiſted heſe men, & yet they haue gotten the victorie. Let then this religion e neuer ſo repugnant to ſenſe, neuer ſo high aboue reaſon, I beleeue is of God, I beleue it is true, elſe by ſuch men & after ſuch a maner, could neuer haue bene perſvvaded. Yea I vvil boldly ſay vvith a ertain lerned man: *Si error eſt (Domine) à te deceepti ſumus: If this vvhich ve beleue be an error, thou (ô lord) haſt deceiued vs:* But thou can neither eceiue nor be deceiued, therfore we are aſſured of our religion. *Rich. de S. Victore. l. 1. Trin. c. 2.*

8 God therfore vvho hath alvvayes deliuered fayth vnto vs ſo redibly, and induced vs vnto it ſo ſvvetly, by probable meanes, yea y euident ſignes and reſtimonies, if he hath permitted this fayth to ecay, or to lye hidden for many hundred yeares, or if corruption and rror in religion, hath for long tyme bene taken for ſincere religion, then no doubt by them, by vvhom he reſtoreth this religion gayne, and deliuereth it in the former perfection, by whom he reormeth theſe errors, vvhich haue gone for truthes, he vvil giue vs robable & credible meanes, by vvhich like reaſonable men, vve ay be induced vnto this reformation. For if vve haue many hunred yeares, bene taught by our forfathers that there are ſeuen Sacraentes, that the Sacrament of the Altar is a Sacrifice, and conteyneth Chriſtes body and blood really, that there is Purgatorie, that we haue reewil, that good vvorkes are neceſſarie, that our euil vvorkes are no vvorkes of God, that payer to Saincts, and reuerence done to them nd their images, is not ſuperſtition: then no doubt, if God vvil haue vs to leaue theſe old opinions, and to imbrace new, he wil in ſo iportant a matter as this is, vvhich toucheth ſaluation and damnation, vſe probable and credible meanes to diſſvvade vs from our old errors, eſt that ſeing no reaſon vvhy vve ſhould leaue them, vve perſiſt ſtil n them, or leſt that vve expoſe our ſelues to danger of imbracing new hereſies, for old religion, as eaſily we may, if without any reaſon at l, vve vvil forſake that fayth, in vvhich vve & our greatgrandfathers vvere baptiſed.

As God plãted religion by credible meanes, ſo he vvil reforme.

Elſe vve might perſiſt in olde errors or imbrace nevv.

9. For although fayth be a Theological vertue, and therfore, as Diuines ſay, conſiſteth not in a meane betvvixt tvvo extremes in reſpect of God, vvho is the obiect (becauſe he is *prima Veritas*, whom we can not credit to ſoone nor to much) yet in reſpect of vs, and the

Faith is a Theological vertue.

Faith in respect of vs is placed betvvixte 2. extremities.

meanes by which we come to know God his authoritie, we may exceed in beleeuing, and we may be wanting in beleef. They are deficient and to slowe in beleeuing, who when God his mind and wil is proposed by sufficient motiues, and to kens, yet wil not giue credit. This was the fault of the Iewes who were so slow and hard of belefe, that though Christ by miracles and prophecies had proued him self to be the Messias, and his doctrine to be of God, yet they would not beleeue him. This also was the fault of the Apostles, though not in so high a degree, whose eyes were so blinded with Christes passion, that although the stone of his sepulchre was remoued, and that the Angel had affirmed that he was risen, yet they would not beleue it, who therfore were called *tardi corde ad credendum, slovve of hart to beleeue.* They are rash & to hastie in beleeuing, who beleeue without sufficient reason or testimonie. Such were the Galathians who were to easily caryed away from that which was preached vnto them. Wherefore the wise man sayeth, that *he is light of hart vvho beleeueth to quickly.* And in dede if God would haue vs giue oure assent where we see no reason, nor testimony sufficient, he should first do vs great iniury, because it is the nature of our vnderstanding, to be moued at least by probabilitie, or credibilitie. Secondly he should expose vs to danger of error, for he that wil beleeue when no probabilitie moueth him, may easily fal into an error. Wherfore it may wel be supposed for certayne, that God wil not haue vs to beleeue any religion, though it be preached in his name, vnles we haue some credibilitie or probabilitie to perswade vs thervnto.

vvho are vvanting in belefe.
Luc. 24.

vvho are rash in beleeuing.
Gal 1.
Eccl. 19.

See the epistle to the Reader.

God vvil not haue vs embrace an improbable religion.

10. If then our reformers would haue vs to beleeue, that in these and these pointes, we and our forfathers haue erred, and that henceforth thus and thus we are to beleue, they must at least shew vs probabilitie, that we haue bene deceiued, and that they are sent to put vs into the way. For otherwise we being forwarned of false Prophets, and commanded also to harken vnto our Pastors, we haue no reason to forsake our ancient religion, and to imbrace new opinions, nor to leaue our ancient Pastors, and to runne after strangers, vnles they can bring some probabilitie, yea and that greater then the old Fathers can bring, for that which they haue taught vs.

Tvvo vvayes for a Doctor to vvine credit.
The first is reason.

11. Two meanes only I find which a Doctor or preacher can vse to perswade his auditors. The first is euident reason which conuinceth the vnderstanding of the hearer or scholar. And by this meanes religion can not be proued, because reason can not reach vnto

mysteries

nyſteries of fayth, vvhich are aboue reaſon. And ſo the reformers can not conuince vs by reaſon, that they are ſent from God to reforme vs, and that their doctrine is the veritie, becauſe they teach many things aboue reaſon, as wel as we do: to wit the Trinitie, Incarnation, Reſurrection, Fayth, Iuſtification, and ſuch like: yea (as I ſhal proue herafter) many thinges alſo againſt common ſenſe and reaſon. Not the firſt, becauſe they are aboue reaſon, not the ſecond, becauſe they are againſt reaſon. The ſecond meanes to perſuade is the authoritie of him vvho teacheth. This meanes Pithagoras is ſayed to haue vſed in his ſchoole, vvho commanded his ſcholars to ſilence for the ſpace of two yeares, al which tyme, they might ouly harken, but not aske any queſtions: and for that tyme they were called *Acoſtici*. *hearers*. Afterwards they might aske queſtions of their Maſter, but vvhen he had anſvverred they might aske no reaſon, but muſt content them ſelues vvith his authoritie, and count it ſufficient, that *Autos ephi* he ſayed ſo.

The ſecond meanes is authoritie.

And. Gel. l. 1. c. 9.

12. Novv, authoritie is vvonne either by vvit and learning, or by vertue, or antiquitie, or number, or office & dignitie. And the reaſon herof is, becauſe vviſe and learned men are likeſt to ſee fartheſt into maters, & ſo the more vvillingly vve beleue them: vertuouſe men are deareſt vnto God, & ſo vve are more eaſily perſvvaded to thinke that God imperteth his mind to them moſt amply. Truth alſo is the daughter of time, for that time bringeth truth to light: & therfore we are moſt prone to beleeue olde men, to whom long time bringeth great experience, & we wel imagine that to be true, which for a long time hath bene holden for true. And becauſe many men ſee more then one alone, vve count the voice of many men, the voice of God, and we reuerence that for a veritie, which moſt men haue auerred. And laſtly becauſe al authoritie is of God, and men in office are appointed by him to gouerne, we are ready to think that God eſpecially directeth them, who haue charge, not only of them ſelues, but of others alſo: which is the very cauſe why vve vſe to reuerence Superiors decrees, vnles we ſee a manifeſt abſurditie in them. If then the reformers wil haue vs to forſake our old Paſtors, and to harken to nevv, if they vvil haue vs abiure old religion & imbrace a new: let them ſhew vs greater authoritie then that of the ancient Fathers, elſe vve haue no reaſon to preferre them and their doctrine, before old Doctors, and old religion. But this they can neuer do, and ſo they can neuer binde vs in reaſon to accept of their religion.

By vvhat meane: authoritie is gotten.

The reaſon.

Rom. 13.

The authoritie of the new ministers and the olde Fathers is vvayed.

13 For if we compare them with the old and ancient Fathers, and the meanes alleaged, by vvhich credit and authoritie is gotten, we shal finde them to come short, by many furlongs in euery one of thē. And first for witt and learning, I think neither Luther nor Caluine nor any of them al, vnles their faces be brasen, haue the face to compare with the ancient Fathers. Namely with Gregories, Austins, Ambroses, Basilles, Hieromes, Cirilles, and such like, who wrote more then euer they read, and studied more then euer they loytered, and were in al literature so learned, that the reformers were not worthy to cary their bookes after them. And although Luther and Caluin wanted not altogether learning, yet they came short of these men. And as for their folowers which were neuer trayned vp in our scholes wel may they prattle in Greeke, and florish in a Ciceronian stile, yet solide learning either in Diuinitie or Philosophie they haue not. Let the vniuersities of Oxford & Cambridge (which for Humanitie I preferre before other vniuersities of the new church) or of Basil and other places, let the cōfraternitie of Geneua shew vs a Ballarmine, Baronius, Molin, Suares, Vasques, Bannes, Gregorie of Valence, an Allen, Harding, Sanders, Stapleton, Bristow, Martin, Campian, Reinolds, if they can. What workes haue they set out comparable to the bookes of these Catholique writers? Let an indifferent reader peruse the learnedest bookes of these reformers, and he shal see in them false allegations of Fathers, corruption of Scriptures, of Fathers and Councels, lyes, impostures, affirmations without proofes, wordes without matter, *and almost nothing else.* As for vertue, if they haue any modestie remayning, they wil not (being guiltie of so vicious liues) make any comparison with the former Fathers, who by the cōmon report of al were Saintes, and their writinges, miracles, almes deedes, fastinges, austere penance, prayer, chastitie, mortification, contempt of the world, and such like, wil testifie no lesse.

For vvit and learning the ministers come shorte.

Sinceritie.

Scarse anie thing but falshood.

Ievvel.

Flessis.

In vertue the ministers are not comparable to the olde Fathers.

14 And although they may obiect that many amongest vs also, haue liued viciously, yet we can giue them herin a manifest difference. For first, the first founders of our religion were men of great perfection, as the Apostles, and their successors in the primitiue Church, yea as the planters of religion in euery countrie were. Read S. Bede, & you shal see, that the Religious Monkes, vvhom S. Gregorie sent into our country, to cal vs from Idolatrie, were Saincts, and moued more the King by their holy conuersation, then by their preaching and miracles? And yet euen the first of these nevv families, the preachers

A difference betwixt heretikes and Catholiques, for euil life. The first.

l. 1. c. 23. ret 26.

of this

of this reformation, euen Luther and Caluin themselues, were notorious, and infamous for euil life. Luther was an Apostata, he maried a Nonne, he liued beastlike, and dyed accordingly. For after a merry and a moyst supper, he was found dead the next morning in his bedde, with his tongue hãging out of his mouth. Caluin liued like an Epicure, he was giuen to reuenge, and vvas puffed vp vvith pride, and ambition. True it is, he caryed markes on his backe, but not such as S. Paul caryed, but such as the minister of iustice noted him withal, for his abominable vice, and as he liued so he dyed, an Herodes death, for lise were his executioners. Secondly although many be badde amongest vs, yet I thinke, more among them. Thirdly euil life amongst vs, is a fault of our owne peruerse wil and nature, but amongst them, it is the verie frute of their doctrine, vvhich (as by many argumentes I shal proue hereafter) leadeth & induceth to al dishonestie. Lastly they which amongst vs lead a vicious life, are neuer amended by comming vnto them: which experience hath taught, and proued in some loose Catholiques, who partly for feare, partly for libertie, haue repayred vnto them. But were so farre from being reformed by them, that so long as they conuersed with them, they fel dayly from one vice to an other, and neuer stayed, til they came to the depth of iniquitie. And yet we haue sen ne many wilde Gallantes, loose in life & rioutos in conuersation, who after that they be admitted into our Church ad societie, & iustructed in our fayth and religion, do cast of al euil customes, become modest in behauiour, temperat, sober, and who before feared neither sinne, nor God, nor the diuil, waxe scrupulous, and fearful of conscience, and who before could not spare one halfe hower in a day for prayer, thinke now vvhole dayes to short a time. Yea you seme to giue good life vnto vs. For you wil trust our word, more then an obligation of one of your owne sect, and if you see a man milde, modest, chaste, temperate, giuen to prayer, fasting, almesdeeds, vpright in al his actions, and examplair in conuersation, you suspect him for a Papist. Therfore some Catholiques the better to escape your Pursiuantes, fayne them selues in outward shew, & habit, to be roisters, ruffians, and dissolute companions, as though vice vvere the badge of your religion. As for number, we excede them by many countries and ages, in vvhich they neuer liued, and for one new minister, we haue hundreds of ancient Pastors, and learned Fathers. For antiquitie, although they fayne an inuisible Church before Martin Luther, yet, as I haue proued in the first chapter, and shal again herafter, their preachers

Luthers and Caluins life and death.
Turrian. l. 5. de Epist pont. c 2.
Hosl. de hæres Gen. l 4.
cronic.
Bolsec. in vita eius. & Gen. l. 4 an Christi. 1566.
The Second difference.
The third.
In the seuenth booke.
The the fourth.
The Catholique religion amendeth euil maners.
Men of good cõscience are suspected to be Catholique.
In number Catholiques exceed heretikes.
For Antiquitie also.

preachers are vpstartes, their doctrine is as young, and vvhereas vve can shew a succession of our religion & Pastors, for the space of sixteen hundred years, euen from the Apostles, they can deriue their pedegree no higher, then from Martin Luther. Lastly our Doctors were also Pastors, and bare great offices in the Church of God. And the first of them in our countrie, and in euery countrie, proued their authoritie by miracles, and their successors proued the same by succession. But as yet, the new preachers could neuer proue their authoritie & mission, to be ether extraordinarie, by miracles: or ordinarie, by succession: as is allerady demonstrated in the first chapter. So that for learning, vertue, antiquitie, number, dignitie, by vvhich authoritie is gotten, we and our religion, do carie the price away. What reason then haue men to forsake Catholiques, and their Pastors & preachers, to harken vnto these new Prophets, who neither in learning, nor vertue, nor antiquitie, nor number, nor dignitie, can make anie iust comparison with them?

S. Bede l. 1. c. 35.

For office and dignitie also.

No reason to preferre the newv preachers.

The discourse of one that doubteh of his ouvvn religion

15. Suppose some one should be wauering, and doubtful in religion, and deliberating with him selfe, whether to folow the old Fathers or new preachers, should make this discourse with him selfe. I haue bene baptized, & brought vp in the Catholique religion, at least so were my forrefathers time out of mind, but of late yeares some haue bene so bold as to auouch, that they were al deceiued, & damned also, vnles ignorance excused them: wherfore seing that without true fayth no man can be saued, it is good that I looke into both the old and new religiō, to see which by al reason I ought to imbrace. But before I giue eare vnto these Reformers, which say that they come to correct old errors, let me see what probabilitie they bring for their pure & reformed religion. First I see they agree not, & yet euery one sayeth, that he teacheth true faith, & reformed religion: & seing that one bringeth no more authoritie thē an other, that is Scripture interpreted by his owne spirit, I see no reason vvhy I should giue credit more to one then to an other, and therfore becaus I can not giue credit to al, I see no reason vvhy I should credit any of them al. Secondly I am forwarned that false Prophets shal come vnsent, and yet auouch also that they are sent from God, and therfore vnles these men could say more for themselues then they can, I see no reason, vvhich can binde me to giue eare vnto them. They say they are sent from God. So vvil false prophets say. And I examining vvhat is their mission, find therein a great defect. For either it is an ordinanarie mission: and then they must shew a succes-

No probabilitie.

For the newv religion.

Hier 1. 13. 14. Mat. 7.

sion of

sion of Pastors vvhose Roomes they supply, vvhich I see they can not do, becausse no historie maketh mention either of their Pastors or their Seruice, or practise of their religion: or it is an extraordinarie, by vvhich they are sent immediatly from Christ, and then they must proue it by miracles, else I must by the same reason hearken vnto euery false prophete. Neither doth it suffice to say, that they preach no other doctrine then the Apostles did, and therfore neede no other miracles, then those vvhich vvere vvrought by them, for so euery Archheretique may say, and you can no way controle him, vnlesse you put him to his miracles. But they alleage Scripture for their doctrine; so haue al heretikes done, as is shewed in the second chapter. But heretiques expounded Scriptures amis, these men hit vpon the right meaning. How shal I know that? they say they haue the true spirit in interpreting of Scripture. But how shal I know, or how cā they tel that, seing that nothing is so secret, as is this spirit, as is proued in the third chapter? And did not Arius say, that he interpreted Scriptures by the true spirit, when he alleaged them, to proue that the Sonne was a creature, and neither equal, nor coequal, nor consubstantial to his Father? Yea do not al heretikes say so, do not al the Reformers say so, euen vvhen they hold contrary opinions? I see no reason therfore, not so much as probable, why I should hearken vnto these reformers, vnlesse I wil harken also vnto al the heretikes that euer were, or shal be. Much lesse can I see any reason, why to forsake my ancient Pastors, who made me and my forfathers Christians, and to preferre these pretended reformers before them. For as for learning they surpassed these reformers, and for vertue they excelled, and so were more likely men to see into the sense of Scripture, and veritie of religion, and were fitter instruments for God to vse, and vessells more capable of God his spirit, and reuelations. In antiquitie they are before them by many hundred yeares, in number they are an hundred at least for one: for authoritie they were honorable Prelats, and Bishops of the Church, vvho proued their mission, commission, and authoritie by succession. yea and by miracles also: neither of vvhich proofes the reformers can alleage for their mission, and authoritie. Shal I then leaue such learned men, for such young clerkes: so vertuous men for so vicious, so ancient Pastors for so new, and so late vpstartes: so many For so few: and men of such pastoral dignitie, for them that can not proue their commission, no more then a false prophet can do? Surely I see no reason vvhy I should, and seing that God wil not bind me, to giue credit

No reason to induce a man tole of the nevv religion.

God can not in reason or iustice damne a man for not being a Caluinist or Lutheran.

to them, that can bring no probabilitie, for their owne or their Doctors authoritie, I see not how with any shew of iustice, God can at the latter day, cõdemne me for not harkening vnto them: for I might answer with reason, that I saw no reason, why I should harken to them, rather then to euery false prophet, much lesse why I should forsake myn ancient religion for a new, and myn old and graue Fathers for a few yong ministers, who were borne but yesterday.

16. By this, gentle reader, thou mayst see, how little reason men of vnderstanding haue, to giue credit vnto the newe religion. But lest I may seme to parcial, or thou (gentle reader) mayst be to timorous in pronouncing the sentence, let the matter be brought before an indifferent iudge, who is neither of the old, nor the new Religion. In Iosephus his histories, I find an example in the like case of cõtrouersie. The Iewes (say:h he) and the Samaritanes, contended once about the place, where God should be worshipped. The Iewes sayed Hierusasem was the place: The Samaritanes would haue it to be the mount Garizim. The matter was brought before a Pagan king, yet a discreet and indifferent Iudge. Prolocutors were appointed on both sides to plead the cause, Sabeus, and Theodosius for the Samaritanes, Andronicus for the Iewes. Andronicus had leaue granted to speake first: who recounteth a succession of the high Priestes from Aaron vnto his tyme, al which time the Iewes were counted the true worshippers of God: he declareth the Antiquitie of the Temple of Hierusalem, and of the Sacrifices there offered: he telleth how that place was euer taken for the true place of worship, and that therfore it was adorned and enriched, not only by the guifts of their owne kinges, but of strangers also, and namely by the kinges of Asia, and that there was neuer doubt of this, til the Samaritanes made a schisme. After that Andronicus had told this tale, the prolocutors of the Samaritanes beganne to speake, but being demanded to shew the like antiquitie, and succession, they could not, but rather were enforced to bewray their infancie, and the reuolt which long after, that God had bene worshipped in Hierusalem, they made from the Iewes. Wherfore the king pronounced sentence for the Iewes, and declared them to be the right worshippers, and the Temple to be the right place, where the Iewish religion was to be exercised.

l. 18. Ant.

Deut. 12. 4. Reg. 15. Io. 4. Io. l. 11. Ant. c. 7 8.

Whether the Iewes or Samaritanes were the true worshippers of God.

The like controuersie be-

17. If In like maner before the like Iudge, I for the ancient Catholique religion, & some one of the ministerie for the new religiõ, were appointed prolocutors: for whom, thinkest thou (gentle reader) would

the sen-

the ſentence be pronounced? If I ſhould beginne to ſhew a ſucceſſion of our Paſtors and religion, by al hiſtories and monuments euen from the Apoſtles? If I ſhould ſhew a catalogue out of Ireneus of al the Popes from S. Peter to Eleutherius, out of Optatus vnto Siricius, out of S. Auſtin vnto Anaſtaſius, our of Euſebius, Genebrard and others, euen vnto theſe dayes, and that in this ſucceſsion, by no Hiſtoriographer was euer noted any change, or fal in Church or religion? If I ſhould proue out of the ſame hiſtories that this ancient catholique Church, was that which was perſecuted by the euil Emperors, and afterwards enriched by Conſtantine and other good Kings and princes, that for this Church, Churches and monaſteries were builded, that in this Church al the general Councels were holden: that by this Church al heretikes were condemned, that this Church was euen by Paganes counted the only Chriſtian Church, that al ancient Fathers, Doctors, Martyres, and Saintes, were members of this Church, ſhould I not incline the Iudge to my part? If when I had done, ſome one of the Miniſtery ſhould riſe vp and beginne to tel his tale, and ſay that al the ancient Chriſtians were deceiued, & liued in error and ignorance, vntil that Luther, or Zuinglius, or Caluin like ſo many Sunnes appeared in our horizon, that the religion of theſe men, is the reformed religion, though it was neuer heard of before. And if being by me demanded, how their preachers proued their miſion, he could alleage no proofe at al, or being asked how they proued their religion, he ſhould anſwere, by Scripture tenſed by his priuate ſpirit, which alwayes hath bene the proofe of al hereſies; & being commanded by the Iudge to ſhew (if their Church be Chriſtian) a ſucceſsion of their Biſhopes, preachers, and practiſe of religion; he ſhould fly vnto an inuiſible Church, or ſay, that the Chriſtian Church decayed quite after the Apoſtles time, and yet could neither tel the time, nor the occaſion of ſo notorious a fal, nor alleage one hiſtoriographer that writeth of ſo great a mutation in the word: If I ſhould tel the firſt tale, and he the ſecond (for I ſee not what betrer anſwer he can make) for him ſelfe: thinkeſt not thou (gentle reader) that the iudge vvould anſvver, that although he beleeued not at al in Chriſt, or his religion, yet that it ſeemed moſt probable, that Catholiques are the true Chriſtianes, and that their Church is the place of the practiſe of this religion, as the Temple of Hieruſalem was of the Iewiſh ſeruice and worſhip of God. If then there be no probable reaſon, by which theſe Reformers can perſwade vs to their reformation, there is no reaſon vvhy we ſhould forſake

tvvipt vs and heretikes.

Iren. l. 3. c. 3. l. 2. cont. Donatiſt. Epiſt. 163.

The good anſvvere a Catholique could make.

The ſlonder anſvvere of a miniſter.

The concluſiō.

our ancient Paſtors to folouv them, vnles vve vvil bynd our ſelues alſo to harken vnto al falſe prophetes, preach they neuer ſo abſurde & improbable doctrine, and ſo open the vvay vnto al heretikes and hereſies.

The Sixt Chapiter proueth, that they haue no Iudge in matters of religion, and ſo do open the vvay to al heretikes, vvho may preach vvhat they liſt, if there be no iudge to controle them.

No ſocietie cã be vvith out head.

ASYET there was neuer ſene any ſocietie wel ordered, were it great or ſmal, but ſome gouernor or moderator ruled & menaged the ſame. For many men as they haue many heades, ſo haue they diuers opinions, and as they are of different complexions and conſtitutions, ſo are they of diuerſe conceipts and inclinations, and therfore wil neuer agree in one, vnleſſe they be directed and commanded by one, or at leaſt by diuerſe vvhich agree in one. Wherfore we ſee that euerie kingdom hath his King, euery dukedome a Duke, euery common welth a Migiſtrate, euery Citie a Maior or Bailife, euery army a General, yea euery village almoſt hath a conſtable, euery familie a goodman of the houſe, euery ſchole a ſcholemaiſter. And ſhal not the Church of God, the ſocietie of his faythful and choſen ſeruantes, haue a viſible head to direct it, and a Iudge to rule it by lawes, and gouern it by authoritie? Or ſhal we think that he hath left that ſocietie, which he calleth his ſpouſe, & which he loued ſo dearly, that he dyed for it, as a kingdom without a King, a Citie without a Maior, an army without a General, a ſhipp vvithout a Pilot, a fold without a Paſtor, or a body without a Head? No, I warrant you he that deſcended from heauen to earth, to eſtabliſh this ſpiritual kingdome, and ſhed his blood to entrich it, hath wel prouided for the gouernment of the ſame, and ſo wel, that therby you ſhal perceiue the skil and wiſdome of the Gouernour.

Much leſſe the Church.

By the effect, it is plain that the Church had euer a head.

2 And truly if by the effect, we may take a ſcantling of the cauſe, the goodly order, the firme peace, & long continuance of the Church, wil beare witnes of a moſt prudent princes gouuernement. For as

diuerſe

diuerſe ſtones in a building could neuer haue kept that order as to make a goodly pallace, had not ſome intelligent workman diſpoſed them: ſo this goodlie order and Hierarchie in the Church, could neuer haue bene eſtabliſhed, had not ſome Prince and gouernor put euery ſubiect in his roome and place. And, as many ſtrings or voices can neuer make one muſical harmonie, vnles ſome cunning muſician tune the ſtrings, and giue vnto euery voice his tone: ſo shal many people of diuerſe diſpoſitions, nations, ſexes, conditions, (ſuch as are in the Church) neuer liue in peace, free from iarres and diſcords, vnles there be a Superior to tune theſe diuerſe natures, and a head to direct theſe diuerſe membres of the body of the Church. And as the ſheepe vvhich want a Shepheard, can not long keepe together, but are like to wander, and to come in danger of the vvolfe: as an armie can not long vvithſtand the enemie, vnles ſome General appoint, and command euery ſouldiar to his ſtanding, and as the ſhippe is not any long tyme free from ſandes or rockes, vvhen the mariner is abſent: ſo could neuer the Church of Chriſt, eſpecially againſt ſo many violent perſecutions, for ſo long a time haue endured, vnles ſome potent and prudent gouernour, by his lawes, vviſdome, and authoritie, had vpholden, guided, and directed it. And the reaſon is, becauſe in a ſocietie, and eſpecially this of the Church, are diuerſe men, yea diuerſe nations, and diuerſe men haue diuerſe natures, and diuerſe natures, haue diuerſe diſpoſitions, and diuerſe diſpoſitions cauſe diuerſe opinions, and diuerſe opinions, moue contradictions, and contradictions end in factions, and factions make an end of al ſocieties, vnles there be a moderator to preuent them by his vviſdom, or appeaſe them by his authoritie.

A ſimilitude

A ſimilitude

A ſimilitudes to proue a head in the Church.

The reaſon vvhy a head is neceſſary in the Church.

3. A head then is neceſſary in al ſocieties, & not only neceſſary but alſo principal. For although the obedient and complying nature of the ſubiect, doth help much to the maintenance of peace and order, yet the head and Superior moſt of al preuaileth. For as the head is the principal part, ſo doth it beare moſt ſway in the gouernment of the bodie, wich is the cauſe why the body is affected according to the head, and vvhy the ſubiect foloweth the Princes humour. Yea euen as vvhen the head in mans body is intoxicated the vvhole body reeleth, and if the head vvant eyes the body tumbleth into ditches, and falleth into danger: ſo if the head of a ſocietie be inconſtant, the vvhole ſocietie wauereth, if the Superior vvant eyes of circumſpection, the ſubiectes are in danger. Wherfore Philip King of Maced & father to

The head in ſocieteis is principal.

A ſimilitude

Another ſimilitude.

Alexander the great, was wont to say: malle se exercitum ceruorum, cui præesset Leo, quam Leonum cui præesset Ceruus: *That he had rather haue an armie of fearful harts, gouerned by a Lion; then of liens, ruled and commanded by a hart*: insinuating thereby, that as the head in a societie is the principal member, so is he most necessarie & principal in gouernment. If then the Church of Christ be a peaceable, and wel ordered body, it hath a head to guide and rule it.

The Church had Adam for her first head in the lavv of natvre.

4. And if we looke into the gouernment of the same, euen from the beginning, we shal find that this goodly common vvelth, neuer vvanted a Prince and gouernour. In the law of nature first of al, Adam our first parent, as he was our common father according vnto flesh, so was he a Priest, and Pastor of the soules of those, vvho liued in his time, and a gouernor of his familie, which vvas descended of him, not only in domestical, ciuil, or temporal, but also in spiritual matters concerning fayth, and religion. For this cause he was indewed with al knowledge and science, that as the first Doctor he might instruct and direct his posteritie; and although by his fal, he lost al infused grace & knowledge yet stil so long as he liued, remained Pastor & supreme head of the Church. Wherfore Theophilus Bishop of Antioch sayeth, that God for no other cause framed Eue out of Adams side, but to demonstrat vnto vs a misterie and figure of the Monarchie of Church: that as Adam vvas head of the same in his tyme, so euer after, there vvas one Pastor chief of al And S. Chrisostom sayeth plainly, that Adam vvas one head giuen vnto al, and his reason is, Because (sayeth he) *God knevv, that æmulation could not be auoided amongst æquals, vvherfore he vvould haue no popular gouernment but a kingdom.* After Adams death, Seth and others succeded him in the like pastoral authoritie euen vnto Noe. Noe dying, Sem his eldest sonne vndertooke the same charge: and euen vnto Aaron the first high Priest of the Leuitical law, al the heres, males of euery familie (if vve beleue S. Hierom) vvere Priestes, vvho ministred Sacramentes, and offered Sacrifices euery one in his familie. And amongst al the Priests of diuers families, one vvas the supreme Pastor and Iudge of the rest, to vvhom belonged the final sentence in matters of religiō. And this supreme authoritie as it seemeth belonged alwayes vnto the most ancient, to whom al the rest as they were in age inferior, so vvere they subiect in authoritie. As for example, Abraham and Sem vvere Priests at one tyme, because Abraham vvas the eldest sonne of Thare, Sem of Noe, yet because Sem vvas the most ancient, he was the higher Priest, & therfore to him (for the Hebrewes as S. Hie-

l. 2. ad Autol

Ho. 14. 1. Cor.

Adams succeſſours in the ſupermacie. Seth.

q. heb. q. 7.

Sem & Melchiſedech al one.

as S. Hierom vvitnesseth, affirme, that Sem and Melchisedech were al one) Abraham offered tithes, and was blessed of him as of his Superior. Yea it seemeth probable that Melchisedech in his time vvas the high Priest and Supreme head of the Church. Wherfore Theophilus speaking of Melchisedech, vttereth these words: ὗτος ἱερεὺς ἐγένετο πρῶτος πάντων ἱερέων τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου *This man vvas a Priest, the first of al the Priestes of God the highest.* Where he can not mean that Melchisedech vvas the first in time and yeares, because Adam, Abel, and Noe before him, and therfore his meaning must be that Melchisedech was the first Priest in dignitie, and the highest of al the Priests of his time. So that euen in the law of nature, that is from Adam to Moyses, there was alwayes an high Priest to rule the Church, and to compose controuersies, that might arise in matters of religion.

Gen. 14.

Supra.

Mechisedech vvas supreme head of the Church.

5. After that, in the lavv writen, the high Priest ruled al in Ecclesiastical affayres, as is playn in the bookes of Exodus and Leuiticus In Exodus we read how Moyses like a spiritual Iudge giueth sentence in causes ecclesiastical, and answereth al doubtes and questions, which arose concerning the obseruation and interpretation of the lavv, and although to ease him selfe he was perswaded to lay part of his charge & burden vpon others shoulders, yet stil he reserueth to him selfe the iudgement of matters concerning the law and ceremonies. And in Deuteronomie vve find that the people vvere commanded, in al difficulties of religion, to haue recourse vnto the Priest of the Leuitical lavv, vvho ruled at that time, and God threatneth that if any be so proud & stubborne as to refuse to obey his sentēce, he shal suffer death by the decree of the Iudge. Wherfore Iosephus in his second booke against Apion sayth, that so the Priestes of that law did dispense, and rule in chiefe matters, that the high Priest had authoritie ouer them. Where a blind man may see that the Synagogue had her Iudge to decide al controuersies in religion. And shal vve imagin that the Church and spouse of Christ, wanteth a head to direct her, and a Iudge to giue her satisfaction in al doubts of religion? No, in the lavv of grace, as God hath bestowed more grace on his Church, then he had done on his Synagogue: so hath he prouided her of a Iudge and gouernor, whom, for his Churches sake, he assisteth more particularly.

In the lavve vvriten vvas also a Supreme head.

Exod. 18.

Dent. 17.

The Synagogue had a head, must more the Church.

6. And first of al Christ him selfe, whilest he liued gouerned this Church him selfe, and in al points played the part of a Supreme Head, High Priest, and Pastor. For he instituted a nevv law, a nevv Sacrifice, & nevv Sacramentes: he ordayned Priestes and ministers, and gaue

Christ the principal and first head of the Church.

gaue them authoritie to preach, & to miniſter, and to gouerne in the Church vnder him. And after that he had withdrawem his viſible preſence from vs, he lefte vs not without an vnder Paſtor, but preſently after his refurrection, he appointed S. Peter his vice-gerent in earth, that ſtil the Church might haue à viſible iudge, to whom ſhe might repayr in al her difficulties. For after his reſurrection he appeareth to his Apoſtles and ſingling out S. Peter from the reſt, he demandeth of him three times, not only whether he loued him, but alſo whether more then the reſt: and finding in dede that he did ſo, & that conſequently he was the fitteſt (for the chiefeſt thing in a Paſtor is loue) he maketh choiſe of him before the reſt, and comitteth to him the charge of his ſheepe, in ſo ample maner, that he excepteth none, but giueth him authoritie ouer al both lambes and ſheepe, that is leſſer and greater Chriſtianes, euen Apoſtles & Biſhops, who al muſt acknovvledge Peter for their Paſtor, if they vvil be the ſheepe of Chriſt. For as S. Bernard noteth, *VVhere there is no diſtinction, there is no exception*,

Chriſt dirg leaueth S. Peter his Vicaire

Io. 21.

Chryſ. in hũc loc. Leo ſer. 3. de Aſſumpt. ſua.

Greg. l. 4. Ep. 32. Theoph. in c. vlt. Io.

Loue is cheefeſt in a paſtor

Amb. in cap. vlt. Lucæ.

l. de conſid.

7. This ſupreme authoritie may plainly be proued not only by the maner of the guifte, but alſo by the promiſe. For S. Peter hauing made that rare confeſſion: *Thou art Chriſt the Sonne of the liuing God*: Chriſt by and by for a recompence of ſo great a faith, maketh him this promiſe. *Vpon this rocke vvil I build my Church.* And although our new Scripturiſtes to deſpoile Peter of this headſhip ouer the Church, by the *rocke* vnderſtand Chriſt him ſelfe, or the faith of Peter, as if Chriſt had ſayed, Thou art Peter and vpon my ſelfe, or vpon thy faith, I wil build my Church: yet this is a wreſted and forced expoſition, becauſe the demonſtratiue pronowne *hanc*, *this*, muſt be referred to that vvhich was ſpoken of immediatly before. And ſeing that Chriſt immediatly before named Peter ſaynig: Thou art Peter, & then immedialy added, *& vpon this rocke I vvil build my Church*, by the *rocke* he muſt needes vnderſtand S. Peter, and neither himſelfe nor the faith of Peter, becauſe he had not ſpoken of them before. And this the Syriake language in which Chriſt ſpake, demonſtrateth. For as Chriſt before had told him, that he was Simon the ſonne of Ionas, and ſhould herafter be called *Cephas*: ſo now changing his name, he ſaith in the Syriak tongue: Thou art *Cephas*, and vpon this *Cephas* I vvil build my Church. As if he had ſayd thou art a rocke and vpon this rocke wil I build my Church. For that is the ſignification of *Cephas*. I graunt that the grecke text is here ambigous, becauſe that changeth the word which is anſwerable to

Rocke vnderſtand Chriſt him ſelfe, or the faith of Peter.

Centur. cent. 1. c. 4.

Cal. l. 4. c. 6.

Io. 1.

Matt. 16.

Hieron. in c. 2. Gal.

Cephas

Cephas, as alſo the Vulgate latin text doth. For in greeke it is thus: *Thou art Peter and Vpon this Peter:* but yet if our new interpreters would here repaire to the fountaine, that is to the Hebrew in vvhich S. Matthew wrote, and Syriake in which Chriſt ſpake, they ſhould eaſily perceiue, vnles they vvould vvilfully erre, that Peter is the Cephas and rocke, on which Chriſt promiſed to builde his Church, and that as the rocke and foundation is the principal part in a building, ſo Peter is the principal part, and head of the Church. Yea both the greeke & latin text do alſo proue S. Peters Supremacie. For both *Petros* and *petra* do ſignifie a rocke, and ſeing that Chriſt promiſeth to build his Church on that rock, which before he had named, Peter muſt be this *rocke* and conſequently head of the Church. Doctor Rainolds in his Cõference with Maiſter Hart, admitteth, that Chriſt, when he ſayd *and Vpon this rocke I Vvil build my Church*, vnderſtood Peters perſon, and yet he ſayth, that thence it foloweth not, that Peter is head of the Church, but only that he is a ſtone, on which the Church is builded. For (ſaith he) the Church is a ſpiritual houſe, of which Chriſt is the firſt fundation, the next ranke of ſtones are the Apoſtles amongſt whom Peter is one, vpon whom with the reſt of the Apoſtles next after Chriſt, this building relyeth. Whence it foloweth, not that Peter is the head of this Church, but only a principal member as the other Apoſtles were, who are called 12. fundations. And with this expoſition he triumpheth, but before the victorie. For firſt, although the Greek vvordes *Petros* and *Petra* may ſometymes ſignifie a ſtone, yet more commonly and properly a rocke, as alſo the latin vvord doth: and *Lithos* in greeke & lapis in latin are the ordinarie vvordes for a ſtone. Secondly the Syriake vvord Cephas, vvhich both the greeke and latin do expreſſe, ſignifieth a rocke. And ſo Peter is not only an ordinarie ſtone of this building, as other Chriſtians are, becauſe the houſe is not rightly ſayed to be built vpon euerie ſtone, but only vpon the fundation, or lower ſtones next to the fundation, neither is he only one of the principal ſtones nere to the fundation, as al the Apoſtles are, becauſe they vvere the firſt preachers and Paſtors, but he is alſo a ſecondarie rocke next vnto Chriſt, on vvhich euen the Apoſtles and Biſhops do rely, as S. Athanaſius ſayth. For that the vvord Cephas, and petra do ſignifie: & the ſingling out of Peter, and the particular promiſe made to him in the preſence of the reſt, argueth that Chriſt promiſed him more then the reſt of the Apoſtles, elſe Peters ſo rare confeſſion, vvhich Chriſt promiſed to reward by building his Church

Epheſ. 2.

Ep. ad Felicẽ.

vpon him, had receued no more recompence then the other Apostles taciturnitie.

8. Lastly the ancient Fathers alluding to this place do cal S. Peter the rocke on vvhich the Church is builded. So do Tertulian, Hippolitus Martyr, Ireneus, Origines, Epiphanius, Hilarius, Leo, Ambrose, Ciprian, Basil, Ciril, Austin, Hierom, vvith many others. And seing that the very text, and the Interpreters of the same, fauour Peters supremacie, I refere it to the Readers, yea to M. D. Reinolds Iudgement (if he lay aside affection, and speake as he thinketh) vvhether the text it selfe, and so many and so ancient and lerned interpreters are to be beleeued, or his bare assertion, vvith the singular glosling of his priuat spirit. I grant that S. Austin by the *rocke*, hath sometime vnderstood Christ, because he his the principal rocke, and others vnderstand the faith of Peter. But yet, S. Austin leaueth to his reader to choose this or the former opinion, vvhich he (vvith others alleaged) foloweth: and this opinion he had neuer folowed had he attended to the Hebrevv & Syriake, vvhich as before calleth Peter him selfe a rocke: as for the others, they differ not from them selues, and the Fathers alleaged, because they only meane that the Church is builded vpon Peters faith, as he is a Publique person and Pastor of the Church. For in two senses Peter may be sayd to be the rocke of the Church, first as he is a particular man, and so if the Church had beene built vpon him, it must haue fallen with him. Secondly as vpon a publique person & supreme Pastor, vvho is to haue successors, to whom constácie in faith is promised, by which they shal vphold the Church. and so the Church dyeth not with Peter, but kepeth her standing vpon successors. And because Peter and his successors, by their indeficient faith, in vvhich as Supreme Pastors they shal neuer erre, do vphold the Church, therfore the Fathers alleaged sometimes say that the Church is builded on Peter, sometimes on his faith, as it is the faith of the supreme head: vvhich in effect is al one. For if Peter vpholde the Church, by his indeficient faith vvhich he teacheth, then Peter vpholdeth the church, as he hath assured faith, & his faith vphold eth the the Church, not howsoeuer but as it is the faith of Peter, and the supreme head, whose faith especially vvhich he teacheth out of his chaire (that is not as a particular man only, proposing his opinion; but as a publique Doctor and chiefe Pastor) defineth and commandeth what al Christians ought to beleeue, shal neuer faile; & consequently the Church vvhich relyeth on his definition, though she may be shaken,

L preſc l. 4. Con. Marc. ca. 5.
L. 3. c. 3.
L. 5. in ep. ad Rom. c. 6. & in matth. de can. nouites. in Ancor. in mat. c. 16. in Anniuers in hymno ep. 55. 79. l de bono patien. l. 2. can. Eu. nom. & hom. 20. & 29 de pen.
L. 4. de Trin ſer. De Cath. pet. & pſ. cou part Don. ep. 4. ep. 17. ad Dam. l. con tel. & in c. 62. Iſa.
L. 1. Rectrac. c. 21. Trint. l. 8. in luc. c. 9. ſupr. a ho. 55 in matt. Epheſ. 2. ep ad Felicem.

shaken, yet shal neuer be ouerthrowne.

9. And seing that after S. Peters death, the Church hath no lesse nede of a visible Pastor, then before, as Christ left him for his vicegerent, so in him did he appoint a continual succession of his successors, that the Church might alwayes be prouided of a visible Pastor. And therfore as Bishops are the Successors of the other Apostles, so some one must succeed S. Peter, & must haue that Superioritie ouer other Bishops, which S. Peter had ouer the other Apostles. And truly, no man more likely to be this man then the Bishop of Rome. For in the Sea of Rome S. Peter did last of al reside, there he dyed, and there, before his death, he appointed Clemens, who refusing, Linus succeeded, & after him Cletus, after him Anacletus, after him Clemens, & so forth euen vnto Clement the eight, who now in Rome residing, ruleth the Church, not only of Rome but of al the Christian world. Wherfore the Bishops of this Sea were euer called the Vicars of Christ, & Successors of S. Peter, they haue euer called general Councels & cõfirmed the same, they made lawes, to vvhich al Bishops, yea al Christians acknovvledged them selues bond & obliged, they haue excommunicated Bishops and Emperours, whersoeuer they liued, thinking none that are Christianes to be out of their iurisdictiõ, they haue taken appellations from al partes, & shewed them selues in al these actions supreme Pastors not of Rome only, but of al the vvorld: and yet vvere neuer counted vsurpers: & therfore sithence that S. Peter must haue a successor, and that needs there must be one visible Iudge vnder Christ, to vvhom in al doubtes we must repayr, the Pope of Rome is likest to be he, or else if any one be more like, then let the aduersarie name him. And if they name any other but him, I vvil anouch that the Church hath bene vvithout a head nere 1600. yeares, for al this while neuer any executed that office but he. S. Hierom I am sure tooke the Bishop of Rome to be the man, for he in a doubt and controuersie of the high Mystery of the Trinity, flyeth to Damasus Bishop of Rome, not that he was more learned then S. Hierom, but because he knew, that for S. Peter, & consequently for his successors, Christ prayed, that he might not erre, but rather confirme his bretheru. *A pastore* (saith he) *paasidũ ouis flagito: Of my Pastor I demand the helpe devv to a sheepe.* Yea (sayth he) Beatitudini tuę, id est, Cathedrę Petri communione consocior, super illam petram ędificatam Ecclesiam scio, quicunque extra domum hanc agnũ comederit, profanus est: To your Blessednes, that is, to the chair of Peter, I am associated by cõmunion, vpon that *rocke* I know the Church

After Peter a head also necessarie,

The B. of Rome S. Peters Successor.

Egesi. l. 3 excid. Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Tertul. l. prescr. Eus. l. 2. c. 25. & in chron. an. 44. Hierom. de viris Illust. in Petro. Sulp. l. 2. hist. Eppph her. 27. Dorothin Synop. Aug. l. 2. con. lit. Petil, c. 51. Pope Victor the Bishops of Asia. Eus. l. 5. c. 24. 25. Bar. an christ. 198.

to be builded, whosoeuer shal eate the lamb out of this house, he is profane. Where he affirmeth that Pope Damasus is the rocke (because he was Peters successor) on which the Church is builded, and that he is profane whosoeuer eateth the lambe out of that house and Church, of which Damasus was the head & rocke. S Bernard calleth Eugenius, once his scholar, but then the Bishop of Rome, once his shepe but then his Pastor, by many honourable tytles. For he saith, that he is the great Priest, the chiefe Bishop, and Prince of Bishops, and heire to the Apostles, who in Primacie is Abel, in Gouernment Noe, in Patriachship Abraham, in Order Melchisedech, in dignitie Aaron, in authoritie Moyses, in Iudgement Samuel, in Power Peter, in vnction Christ. S. Gregorie Nazianzen saith, the Romaine Church doth beare authoritie, because that the Emperial seate was seated in Constantinople. Ciril saith that *We must, being members, sticke to our head the* Romain Bishop. S. Hierom calleth Damasus Pope, his Pastor and the successor of Peter. S. Austin with the whole Concel of Mileuet hath recourse vnto Innocentius Pope, as vnto their Superior, because, sayth he, God hath placed him in the Apostolical seat: & in an other Epistle, he saith, *that in the Roman Church hath euer florished the principalitie*. Prosper his Scholar sayth, that the Romain Church is *head of the world*. Anselmus Archbishop of Canturburie dedicating his booke to Pope Vrbane, calleth him Lord and Father of the whole Church. S. Ciprian calleth the Romain Church, the mother Church of al, and the chaire of Peter. Anacletus saith that the Romain Church receiued the Primacie of our Sauiour, when he sayd to Peter: Thou art Peter, and vpon this rocke etc: which could not be true, if the Roman Bishop were not Peters Successor. Ireneus calleth the Romain Church, the *greatest* Church, to which euerie Church must repaire, by reason of the more powrable Principalitie. Ignatius in his Epistle to the Romanes geueth the Romain Church many glorious titles. By which it is plaine, that the Fathers and the practise of the Church and Councels acknowlege the Romain Bishop for Peters Successor, and the head of the whole Church.

l. 2. de Consid.

In cap. de vita sua.

In lib. The. Sauri.

Ep. ad Damasum.

Ep. 92. ad Innoc.

Ep. 262.

l. de Ingratis.

c. de Incar.

l 1.

l. 1. Ep. l. 4

Ep. 8.

Ep. 3.

l. 3. c. 3.

The new christians are vrged to tel their head of their Church vnder Christ

10. Now then let our new Christians, if they be the Church of Christ, which euer had a visible head, tel vs who is their supreme Iudge, and Pastor? They wil say peraduenture, that Christ him selfis their Iudge, and Pastor, and that they neede no other, because as he planted his Church, so stil he ruleth the same. But this shift will not serue the turne: for Christ now conuerseth not visibly amongst vs, so

besides

beſides him, the viſible Church muſt haue a viſible head, as hitherto ſhe hath euer had. And although Chriſt ſtil remayneth our High Prieſt, Doctor, and Paſtor, yet he offereth not Sacrifice immediatly, but only by his vnderprieſtes, neither doth he teach vs by his owne voice or reuelation, but by Doctors, vvhom S. Paul ſayeth, he hath appointed, neither doth he feede vs by his owne hand, but by the hand of inferior paſtors, who miniſter his Sacraments vnto vs, & deliuer his word in the true meaning, by vvhich the ſoule liueth. Wherfore beſids him, the Church being a viſible body, muſt haue a viſible head, elſe we may ſay of it, as once Epaminondas ſayed of a great armie which wanted a General, *Video pulcherimam beſtiam, ſed ſine capite: I ſee a very fayre beaſt, but vvithout a head.* And the reaſon herof is, becauſe a head and Iudge in the Church, is neceſſary to decide controuerſies in religion, vvhich ariſe almoſt euery age, yea often in the ſame age, ſith then vve can not now haue acceſſe to Chriſt, beſides him we muſt haue a viſible Iudge, vvhich Chriſt him ſelfe vvel knowing, preſently after he had left vs, he appointed S. Peter as his vicegerent, as is already proued.

Beſides Chriſt a viſible head is neceſſarie.
Io. 10.
Heb. 5. 6.
Pſ. 109.
Epheſ. 4.
Mat. 4.

Vvhy a viſible head beſides Chriſt is neceſſarie.

11. I demand then of al the profeſſors of this new religion, eſpecially of them in England, vvho is their Iudge in controuerſies of religion? They can not ſay that Scripture is this Iudge, becauſe Scripture is but a written law, that can not ſpeak, nor interpret her ſelfe: and therfore if the controuerſie be, vvhich is Scripture, or vvhat is the meaning of it, Scripture can giue no ſentence: yea I haue demonſtrated in the ſecond Chapter that bare Scripture is no ſufficient Iudge in any matter of religion. They can not alleage the ſpirit to be this Iudge, as is euidently proued in the third Chapter: neither wil they confeſſe that the Pope, Fathers, or Councels are this Iudge, and if they would, al theſe would condemne them, as is declared in the fourth Chapter. Peraduenture they wil be Iudged by their founders, Luther, Caluin, and ſuch others. But firſt theſe agreed not, neither one with an other, nor with them ſelues: for what one affirmeth an other denyeth, and vvhat one of them taught one yeare, he corrected the next, and if they had agreed, yet were they no ſufficient Iudges, becauſe they can not proue their miſſion, as is proued in the firſt Chapter, and ſo are not to be admitted for lawful Iudges, vnles we vvil admitt alſo al falſe prophets. Who then is this Iudge, to whom in controuerſies they repayr, and by vvhoſe iudgement they ſquare out their religion.

Vvho is the Iudge in matters of religiõ in England?
Bare ſcripture no ſufficient Iudge.
As is proued.
The animal ſpirit is no firſt Iudge.
The Pope and Councels in England are reiected.
The funders of the nevv religion no lovvful Iugde.
The reaſon.

12 They wil ſay perchance that the Prince is this Iudge. But this is as vnlikely, and as flatte againſt Scripture, & practiſe of the Church,

The Prince is not Iudge in theſe matters.

King Henrie the eight and Q. Elizabeth vvould not meddle in expounding Scripture, though they chalenged the Supremecie in causes ecclesiastical.

as any thing can be. And although the late Quene, and her Father before her, did chalenge as dew vnto them authoritie in causes Ecclesiastical, of vvhich I dispute not at this tyme, yet I am sure they would not entermeddle in matters of religion, to geue sentence vvhat is the meaning of Scripture, vvhich bookes are canonical, and vvhat opinions are heretical, and contrary vnto Gods word, no more then they would entermedle in ministring of Sacraments, or peraching of Gods word. For they knew wel ynough what Iosaphat, that good king sayed, that Amarias the high Priest vvas to rule in matters of religion, & Captain Zabadias to menage matters belonging to the Kings office. And Ozias may be a sufficient exãple vnto al Princes, who was strickẽ with a leprie for vsurping the Priests office in incensing. We read in dede that Christ commanded S. Peter to feed his sheepe & to gouerne his Church, Priests also & Pastors haue the same charge cõmitted vnto them: yea the Prophet Isaie sayeth: that Princes are Nurces, Furherers, fouourers and defenders of the Church, but he neuer calleth them rulers of the Church, nor Iudges in religion. Wherfore S. Ambrose Bishop of Milan vvriting to his sister, sayth that he told Valentinian the Emperour, vvhat belonged to his office in these words: *Truble not thy self, O Emperour, as to think that thou hast any Imperial right to meddle in diuine matters. Extolle not thy self, but if thou vvilt raygne long, be thou subiect to God. It is vvriten: giue to God vvhich belongeth to God, and to Cæsar vvhich belongeth to Cæsar. Vnto the Emperour Pallaces appertaine, vnto the Priest Churches. The charge of the publique vvalles is committed to thee, but not of sacred and holy things.* A sentence vvorthy to be set in a tablet of gold, and to hang about a Princes neck. And truly if Princes vvere Iudges of Religion we must change religion at their pleasures, and so we should haue almost as many religions as Princes.

Vnto the parliament is not Iudge in matters of faith and religion.

13. Much lesse can the Parlament be Iudge in Religion, for that consisteth of temporal men, for although in England the Lordes spiritual are ioyned with the temporal, yet are they al ruled by the Prince. And vvhere, I pray you, doth Scripture vvarrant vs, that the Parlament is our Iudge in matters of religion? yea we see that Parlamentes varie in religion, and so they can giue no certain sentence for religion. In France the Parlament is Catholike, & is cõtent to be subiect to the Pope, & in no wise wil medle with matters of religion. In King Henries time, the eight of that name, the Parlament enacted six Catholique Articles. In King Edvvards time the Parlament alowed of an other religiõ, in Queen Maries time of an other, & in Queen Elizabeths time of an other,

A vvorthy sentence for al Kings.

Sanderus in l. de Schis. Angelic. Also. Stovv in his. Chronicle.

an other. If then the ſame man had liued in al theſe princes tymes (as many haue doone) and the Parlament be Iudge, he muſt in conſcience, though religion be but one, haue changed fowre times his religion, elſe had he bene fowre tymes an heretike, & as often a traytour. Yea I thinke if the Parlament vvere demanded to define vvhich bookes of Scripture are canonical, and vvhich is the true meaning, they vvould anſwer, that ſuch matters belong not to them. But you wil anſwer, that the Parlament is Iudge vvhen it is conformable to Scripture, as it is at this preſent, but was not in Queen Maries tyme. Thus they may anſwer but with how litle reaſon, it wil eaſily appeare. For either the Parlament preciſely, or the Parlament agreeing with Scripture is this Iudge? If they grant me the firſt, then muſt we in conſcience change religion as often as the Parlament changeth. If they grant only the ſecond, then is the Parlament no infallible Iudge, yea no Iudge at al: for yet we muſt haue a Iudge to iudge the Parlament, and to determine vvhen the Parlament foloweth the word of God: elſe ſhal we neuer be ſatisfied. And vvho I pray you is this Iudge?

An abſurd anſvvere refuted.

14. Now I ſee not vvhom they can name, vnles it be my Lord of Canturbury, or the miniſterie of England, or of al countries vvhere their religion floriſheth. But then I demand of them, firſt vvhere they read in Scripture, that their Clergie is an infallible Iudge in matters of religion? They wil ſay, that the Scripture commandeth vs to giue credit to our Paſtors. True, but if I deny that they are true paſtors, they can not proue them ſelues to be ſo, becauſe they can not proue their miſſion, as in the firſt chapter is proued moſt euidently. Secondly, the Clergie of England, ſince King Henry the eight, hath changed religion diuers tymes, and this new Clergie vvas neuer yet conſtant in fayth, for one whole yeare together: yea they agree not amongſt them ſelues, and ſo can be no aſſured and infallible Iudge. Thirdly either the Clergie of England is Iudge in matters of religion, becauſe it is the Clergie of England, or becauſe it is the Clergie of a vvhole countrie, or becauſe it conſpireth with the vniuerſal Clergie of their religion. If they grant me the firſt, then doth it folow that only the Clergie of England is this Iudge, and ſo al other countries muſt be ſubiect to the Engliſh Clergie, to which they wil neuer agree. If they grant the ſecond, then euery Clergie of a vvhole countrie is Iudge, and ſo we ſhal haue as many religions almoſt as countries: and although the new Clergies of England, Germany, Scotland, Holland, Geneua, are contrarie ech one to the other, yet the people of euery country muſt acknowledge them as Iudges,

Neither the nevv Clergie of England, nor of other countries vvhich profeſſe the nevv religion is a fitte Iudge.
The firſt reaſon.
The ſecond.
The third.

as Iudges in religion, and so must imbrace contrarie opinions. If they grant the third, I must desire them to agree al amongst them selues, before we stand to their iudgement. For if this new Clergie be diuided into many Sects, as al the world seeth it is, then seing we haue no more assurance of one Sect, then of an other, we may refuse to be iudged by any of them, especially they them selues refusing to be iudged, one by an other. Yea not al this new Clergie, nor any Sect of the same, can proue their mission, and therfore are not to be admitted for true Pastors and Iudges in Religion, vnles we wil receiue al false Prophets also, and false Apostles.

15 Is there no Iudge then, neither in England, nor in al the new Church of the Gospellers. If there be, let them name him, if they can: if there be none, as it seemeth there is not (for I haue named, and reiected by good reason, al vvhom I think they can name) then is not their Church the Church of Christ, in vvhich, as is before proued, is alwayes resident a visible Iudge to compose controuersies: yea then the Church (vvhich, as I shal proue in the next booke, is a peaceable kingdom) shal be a common vvelth the worst prouided for that euer vvas: it shal be a body without a head, a kingdom vvithout a King or Prince to command, a conuenticle of vvranglers, the worst ordered and the most dissentious societie that euer vvas: to be briefe, the Church militant in earth, shal more resemble that mutinous route of the damned in hel, then the peaceable societie of the Church triumphant in heauen: yea then shal that folow vvhich I intended to proue, to wit, that in the new Church of the Gospellers, there is no meanes to compose and determine controuersies, because vvhere there is no visible Iudge, there euery man may beleeue and preach vvhat he list, and no man can controle him: and if diuers preach contrarie doctrin, they may go together by the eares, and no man shal be to part the fray, because there is no Iudge to take vp the matter betwixt them: and so the gappe is open to al false prophets, vvhose doctrin must go for currant, be it neuer so absurd, because there is no Iudge to giue sentence of the truth or falshood of the same.

Chap. 6.

16. And to make the matter more plaine, suppose that now in Englād some new preacher should preach a new heresie, yea that many at once should preach contrary opinions, and so fal to variance, there vvould be no meanes to compose these controuersies: because there is no Iudge to take vp the matter, neither is there any way to preuent them, because where there is no Iudge to define, euery man may teach vvhat

A supposition.

vvhat he liſt, and vvhere euery one may teach vvhat he wil, there ariſe iarres and diſcords, and vvhere no meanes are to appeaſe them, the ſocietie is ruined: *Becauſe euery kingdom diuided vvith in it ſelfe, ſhal be made deſolate.* Luc. 11.

17. But in this caſe peraduenture they would cal a Prouincial or general Councel, and ſo compoſe matters by common conſent. Be it ſo that they could cal ſuch a councel, and could alſo, al or the moſt part agree, yet I ſee not how we are warrãted to aſſure our ſelues that they al can not erre, & that therfore we may rely vpon their ſentence, For if they ſay, they are waranted becauſe they are the true Paſtors, I can tel them that this is not ſo ſure, becauſe they can not proue their miſſion, and demand of them, whether the Catholique Clergie, which is farre greater, and vvhich for fiften hundred yeares before Luther was heard of, was counted the only Clergie, may not haue their voice, and if they may, certainly their voice wil be negatiue, and oppoſit to theſe mens affirmatiue. But this is ſpoken vpon ſuppoſition, that they could cal a councel and agree alſo in the ſame, for I haue good cauſe to doubt, that they neither can cal a coũcel, nor would agree in a councel. For if there be no viſible ſupreme Iudge, nor Paſtor in their Church, as I haue proued that there is not, vvho ſhould cal this councel and ſummone al the Clergie to appeare.

A Councel of their Clergie vvould not ſerue.

They can not cal a Councel.

Lut I conc 51.

18. Luther and Caluin ſay, that this belongeth to the Emperour: but ſeing that this is an Eccleſiaſtical office concerning religion, it can not appertain vnto a temporal Prince, and now that the Emperour is a Catholique and a Papiſt as they terme him, I thinke they vvould not obey him if he ſhould ſummone them to apeare, eſpecially becauſe he vvould cal Catholique Biſhops, and vvould giue the preeminence to them. But I haue proued already that the Emperour though in the name of the Pope as an aſſiſtant, he may by the Churches permiſſion, cal a councel, yet of him ſelfe he can not meddle in ſpiritual matters. Wherfore the Councel which the Apoſtles called, was called without the Emperours authoritie: where then there is no Supreme Paſtor (as I haue proued that amongſt them is none) vvhoſoeuer ſhould take vpon him to cal a councel, ſhould vſurpe, and the others might refuſe to obey his cal.

Calu li 4. Inſt. c. 4.

No man amongſt them to cal it.

Not the Emperour.

The firſt Coũcel vvithout an Emperour.

19. Peraduenture they would chooſe one by common conſent, & ſo al would ſtand to his arbiterment. But in this alſo is difficultie, for vvhere there is none to command, who ſhal cal them together to agree in the election of one man? Yet let vs ſuppoſe that they ſhould

They can not Chooſe a Iudge.

meet by chaunce, as crowes do in the Peaſe-field: when they are met, it is not ſo eaſie to agree vpon one, & vvhen they haue agreed, it is not eaſie to agree vnto his ſentence. For if he pronounce ſentence for the Proteſtant, the Puritan wil repine, and may ſay that he hath no warrant for his ſentence, who is but a man, conſtituted by men, and can ſhew no Scripture to proue that he can not erre.

If they could he vvere not ſufficient.

As yet they neuer could.

20. But truly I can not think that in this matter, they vvould euer proceed ſo farre. For as yet they neuer called a Councel together out of al partes of their Church, and thoſe that vvere called together, for vvant of a Iudge to determine, could neuer agree in any one point of religion. Surius relateth how on a time twelue Catholique Doctors and twelue Miniſters met at Wormatia, to make ſome attonement betwixt the Confeſſioniſtes, but after a litle diſputation fiue of the twelue miniſters were excommunicated by the reſt, and caſt out for vvranglers: and ſo nothing was concluded. Diuerſe other aſſemblies and meetings they haue attempted, but al ended in thundering excommunications, bitter taunts, and infamous libels, and as yet they neuer could agree in any councel vpon any controuerſie in religion, & al for vvant of a viſible Iudge, & Paſtor, to whom al the reſt are ſubiect.

Anno 1554. Gen. Cron. Vanie attempts for a Councel. Stapl. l. 4 de prim. ſed c. 33.

By leauing the Church, this they haue gotten. Luc. 22.

21. And this they haue gotten by leauing the ancient Catholique Church: which acknowledgeth the Biſhope of Rome, as S. Peters Succeſſor, and Chriſtes Vicare, and relyeth vpon his ſentence as infallible, becauſe Chriſt prayed for him, that his fayth might not fayle; and becauſe he hath Supreme authoritie (vvhich al Catholique Biſhops haue euer acknowledged) he hath called many Councels and determined many controuerſies, & vvhileſt the Church euer ſtandeth to his Iudgement, vvhich neuer yet was contrary to it ſelfe, ſhe enioyeth great peace, and vnitie in fayth and Religion. Wheras the Goſpellers, becauſe they haue no viſible head, could neuer cal Councel, neuer agree vpon any one point of religion, which was before in controuerſie, & neuer ſhal hereafter: becauſe matters of religion are hard, and therfore vvhere there are many heads, there are many opinions, and where are many opinions, there are many contradictions, and ſo no peace, nor vnitie, becauſe no one ſupreme viſible Iudge to determine.

The cauſe of Vnitie in the Cath. Church.

VVhy the Goſpellers diſſent.

22. And as for vvant of a viſible Iudge, they can not appeaſe diſſenſions after they are riſen, ſo can they not preuent them. For if there be no viſible Iudge euerie Cockbrain may preach his owne fancies for true fayth, and religion, and no man ſhal controle him, nor condemne his doctrin, nor forbid his preaching: becauſe if there be

no vi-

no visible Iudge, no man hath the authoritie, and so the gap is open to al false prophetes, who may enter into the new Church, thike, & threefold, because no man therein is of authoritie to forbid them. Whence it foloweth that if vve accept of the new religion, and incorporate our selues to the new Church, we expose our selues to al false prophetes, vvho may preach what they please, because no man hath authoritie to controle them.

The Conclusion.

The seuenth Chapter auoucheth, that the newv Christians knovv no end of beleeuing: and consequently if vve receiue their religion, vve shal neuer be setled, but alvvayes vncertain, and alvvayes seeking, and yet alvvayes to seeke.

NO creature so vnable, but it hath some action, no action so vaine but it hath some end præfixed, and no end so bad, but it giueth some contentment: because euery action is a kind of motion, and al motion is for rest, which only is to be found in the end. And therfore no creature resteth til it attaine to the end appointed, & none there is that resteth not, vvhen it hath attained roit. The heauens for some end, do moue without end, that is for a more æqual distribution of their light and influences. The foure Elementes with no litle hast hasten to their homes and places, where when they are arriued, they take their natural rest, because they haue obtained their end: and byrdes for some end do build their litle pallaces in that forme and fashion; & for some end, the spider also weaueth that his curious web, whose threeds he spinneth out of his owne bowels; but hauing finished that taske, he resteth contented, though he receiue no other recompence then flyes for his labour. To be briefe, al creatures ayme at some intended end, and (as the Philosopher saith) euery Agent worketh for an end: and the reason therof he yeeldeth, because the end is the cause of causes, and that which first exciteth and moueth to operation: and therfore if that were not, either creatures would be idle, hauing no end to moue them, or they should worke in vaine, because to no end or purpose, or they should alwayes be working, without hope of reposing, be-

Al creatures ayme at some end.

L. 2. Phys & Th. 1. 2. 4. 1.

The reason.

cause no action ceaseth til it attayne to the end, where only is the place of resting. And to illustrate this discourse by a clere and plaine example. If bearing of fruites were not the end of trees, they would neuer begin to budde, because the end of budding is bearing: or if they should budde, without possibilitie of bearing, they should alwayes be budding, and neuer bearing, and so should budde in vaine also, because to no end nor purpose. Wherfore (to draw this beginiugto my end proposed, if our new Reformers be desirous, that we should admit their doctrin, and beleeue their preaching, they must shew vs some end of beleeuing: because beleeuing is an action, and euerie action is for rest, which only can be found in the end. Or if there be no end of beleeuing amongst them: one of these three thinges must of necessitie folowe: to wit, that either we can not with any reason beleeue them at al, because there is no end to moue vs: or that we shal beleeue them in vaine, because to no end nor purpose: or else we shal bynd our selues to a restles beleeuing, and so shal alwayes be seeking, and yet alwayes to seeke in our faith and beleefe: which must needs breed discontentment in an vnresetled mynd, and contempt also of al religion, when we see no certain stay in any. True it is that we are commanded to seeke, and especcally for true faith and religion, because that is the groundworke of al: but we are promised also to fynd, else should we seek in vaine, because the end of seeking is fynding. We are bidden also to aske, but promise is made withal, that we shal obtain our sute, else should we aske in vaine. And we are willed to knocke also, but with a warrant that it shalbe opened, else should we knocke in vaine, because the end of knocking is opening. *But where* (saith Tertulian) *shal we find an end of asking, knocking, and seeking? With Marcion? But Valentinus also biddeth vs seeke with him, and we shal fynd. With Valentinus? But Appelles will vrge vs with the same proposition: and Ebion: and Simon Magus, and euerie one of them, will seek to drow me vnto him.* The like question do I demand of our new Reformers. Where shal we find an end of beleeuing. With Luther, who called the B. Sacrament Christ his body, because it is really in the bread and with the bread? But Zuinglius biddeth me seeke with him, affirming that it is called Christes body because it is a figure of it. With Zuinglius? But Caluin addeth to him, that the Eucharist is not a bare signe or figure, because though it contain not Christes body really, yet whilest it stirreth vp faith, which apprehendeth Christ, it conueigheth Christ really vnto vs by a secret conveihance. With Caluin? But his scollars haue sought further,

An Example.

The application.

Mat 7.

Ibidem.

Ibidem.

L. Prese. c. 10.

A question, where to find a stay in beleefe.

further, and haue corrected him in many pointes: and therfore they also wil cal vpon me to seeke vvith them. VVhence it must needs folow that I shal alwayes be seeking, and neuer finding an end of beleeuing. Thou wilt say, that I may harken to some one of these Sectmasters, and shut myn eares to the rest. But certes this I can not do with any shew of reason. For first euerie one of them, alleageth the same authoritie to drow me vnto him, to wit Scripture sensed by his priuate spirit: and so if for this authoritie, I begin to folow Luther, I must folow Zuinglius also, vvho bringeth the same authoritie: and after Zuinglius, I must runne after Caluin, because he vrging the same argument deserueth the same credit: and so I shal rune my selfe cleane out of breath in running after Sectmasters, and yet shal neuer find that which I seeke for, which is a stay in religion but shal alwayes be to seeke and yet neuer find. Secondly suppose I could cleaue to one only Sectmaster, & seuer my selfe from the rest, yet neither thus can I find any stay or rest in beleeuidg, because he also him selfe is alwayes seeking without any hope of fynding. Luther once affirmed, that faith only was the thing which iustifieth, that euil workes can not hurt, where faith is present: that good vvorkes are not necessarie, but rather pernicious, that they which are laden with lackes of good workes, must lay down such incombrances, if they wil passe the narrow straites to heauen: yea that such are like to the pilgrimes of S. Iames of Compostella, who lading their heades and shoulders with multitudes of shelles, make their pilgrimage more vneasy. And yet in his visitation of Saxonie, he saith, good workes are necessarie, and can not be separated from a true faith. Once also he absolutely de nyed friewil, and boldly auouched, that wickeph if sayd truly, when in one of his articles condemned at Constantia, he affirmed most lewdly, that al thinges happen by a fatal destinie. And yet the same Luther in his aforesaid visitation, complayneth much, that some very indiscreetly do babble of friewil, and confesseth plainly, that man hath friewil in external actious, and frie choise and election to do good and auoid euil. He once affirmed Scripture to be more easie, then al the Fathers commentaries: and yet in an other place, he humbly confesseth that neither he nor the wisest nor holyest, can with any modestie, yea not without impudencie, promise to expond the Psalmes in euery part, no not any part of Scripture in al pointes. The like is his inconstancie in his opinion of the number of Sacramentes. For once he sayd: that he must deny seuen Sacramentes, and

Giue eare to one, and giue eara to al.

Luth. in c. 2. Gal l de libert. Christ. l. de Capt bab. ser. in illud: Sic Deus dilexit.

L. de visit Saxon.

In assert. art. 36 damnati a leone. 10.

L. de visit. Sax Præfat. assert. art. damnat. 1. a leone 10.

præfat in psalmos.

L. de Capt. Bab.

and falow of three for the tyme. Hade saith for the tyme, because hade vvas not yet sure, whether his spirit might chance so to blow, as to blow away one or two or al those three. Zuinglius and Carolstadius once iumped with Luther, but afterwards they left him in the lurch, and changed as he him selfe had done. How mutable Melancthon was, his diuers editions of his common places wil testifie. How Caluin hath cauilled, changed, and contradicted him selfe, one Westphalus Heshusius, and other Lutheranes protestrantes haue noted very diligently. So that they them selues are so variable and inconstant, that we can haue no more hold of them then of a slippery eele. The reason of this is, the vncertaintie of the rule, by vvhich they square their doctrin. VVhich rule is the bare letter of Scripture, which is obscure and ambignous, and the priuate spirit, vvhich is secret, and as mutable as the wind, or wethercocke: as is before in the second and third chapters more at large declared. For as if the Seaman would bind him selfe alwayes to sayle towards that coast, to which the wind bloweth, or the Cock standeth, should neuer be assured of his voiage: so they that wil square religion by bare Scripture, and the priuat spirit, as al the Reformers do, shal neuer be assured of their faith or beleefe, because the bare letter of Scripture is pliable to al heresies, and the priuat spirit is as changeable as a chamelion, and as mutable as any Proteus. So that, neither by harkning vnto diuers sect. Masters, nor by cleauing and stiking to any one of them, can we fynd any certain stay in beleefe, faith, and religion. Hence it is no doubt, that many in England vvho runne on lyke blind bayards, neuer looking before them, are doubtful, perplex, and neuer setled in religion, but fal from Puritanisme to Brownisme, from Brownisme to Barowisme, from many religions, to no religion, and so to Atheisme. VVherfore he that vvil fynd any certainty, and vvil not alwayes be seeking, and consequently neuer fyndnig, he that wil know and set some stay and end in beleeuing, he that wil not be alwayes vnresolued and perplex in religion, let him repayre vnto the Catholique and Romain Church, which (as I shal proue in the next booke) is the only place of peace and vnitie, and the quiet hauen of tranquilitie. And he that wil stand sure and steadfast, let him keepe his standing vpon this piller of truth. The reasons why this Catholique Church is a place of peace, are many. The first is because she is directed by the Holy Ghost, vvhich is the God of peace, and alwayes teacheth the truth, which is but one. Secondly the high Pastor and head of the Church, vvho

A reason of this inconuyscie.

A similitude

How men fal to Atheisme.

In the Romain Church is only stay.

Chap. 6.
1. Tim. 3.
The cause of vnitie and stay.
Io, 14. 15.

vvho vnder Christ gouerneth this Church in a visible maner (which Pastor is the Vicare of Christ, and Successor of S. Peter, and no other then the Romain Bishop, as in the former Chapter is proued) is an other cause of this vnitie: because whilest al obey one, who (as before in the former chapter also is proued) can not swerue from the truth, because he is the rock of the Church, for vvhom Christ prayed, that his faith might not faile, al must needes agree in one, because faith and truth is but one. Thirdly the rule and square by vvhich al Catholiques trie their religion, is a third cause of this vnitie, and that is, the definition of the Church, or Scripture expounted by the Church, vvhich rule was alwayes so right, and so vnuariable that our religion squared by it, hath alwayes bene the same. And therfore S. Paul biddeth Timothie to keep the depositum, & faith, vvhich as a treasure is committed vnto him and to the Bishops his Successors, and consequently to the Church, vvhich as Ireneus witnesseth, is diues depositorium *a rich treasure house* of this treasure. And whilest this Church inuenteth no new beleefes, but stil keepeth the old, as an ancient treasure committed to her fidelitie, she maintaineth peace and vnitie amongst vs, because she stil teacheth the same. Wherfore Tertullian saith: that Christ hauing instituted our faith, al nations must seeke for it, til they haue found it, but after that they haue found it, they must seeke no further, but persvvade them selues that no further is to be sought, because no endles seeking is of a certaine thing. And therfore, sayth he, let them looke to it better, vvho are alwayes asking, knocking, and seeking; because they aske there where no body is to grant, and they knock there vvhere none is to open, and they seeke there vvhere no certaintie is to be found. To this counsel I wish and pray, that my countrimen in England would voutsafe to harken and giue eare: for then I persvvade my selfe they would more spedely leaue their new preachers and Sect masters, because amongst them shal neuer be fond cetayne stay in religion. For if they harken to one, they must harken to al that come, because al alleaging the same athoritie, vvhich is Scripture sensed by a priuat spirit, must needes be credited alike, & so shal they folow one new preacher after an other, and though they rune them selues out of breath, yet they shal neuer fynd any rest or stay amongst them, as is already proued. Or if euery one will choose some one sectmaster to sticke vnto, vvhich yet he can not in any reason do, because he that cōmeth after him, vvil alleage as much as he hath dono, & so also must be credited: yet shal he find no stay in religion, because he folowing

The second.

Mat. 16.
Luc. 22.

The third.

1. Tim. 6.

L. 3. con. her. c. 4.

Vide vinc lyr. l. con. prophan.

L. præscr. c. 10.

The Autours Consel.

an vn-

an vncertaine rule, vvhich is Scripture ſenſed by a priuat ſpirit, muſt needs him ſelfe vvant a ſtay, as alſo is proued. Or if he vvil ſtand poſt alone, and truſt only to him ſelfe and his owne priuat ſpirit, yet neither thus can he find an end of beleeuing, becauſe this ſpirit is diuers and variable alſo, not only in diuers, but alſo in the ſame men, as already is declared. And ſo he that wil forſake the Catholique and Romain Church, vvhich is the piller of truth, and the hauen of al tranquillitie, and wil liſten & giue eare to nevv preachers, or priuat ſpirits, ſhal neuer be ſetled nor reſolued in religion, but alwayes doubtful, perplex, variable, alwayes ſeeking and yet alwayes to ſeeke, and ſhal as ſoone catch a hare with a taber, as find out any end of beleuing amõgſt theſe new preachers and priuate ſpirits: and ſo either he can not beleeue them at al, becauſe there is no end of beleeuing to moue him to beleeue, or elſe he ſhal bynd him ſelfe to a reſtles beleeuing of new preachers and doctrines; which, as it is vayne and to no purpoſe, becauſe it hath no end, ſo muſt it nedes breed a great diſguſt and diſcontentment in the mynd of the beleeuer, & leaue him ſtil vncertaine and vnreſolued in religion.

The Concluſion.

1. Tim. 3.

THE

THE SECOND BOOK CONTEINETH A SVRVEY OF THE MARKES OF HERETIKES, WHICH ARE PROVED TO AGREE SO fitly to the professors of the nevv religion, that if euer there vvere any heretikes, these are heretikes.

The first Chapter handleth the first marke of an heretike, vvhich is the breach he maneth out of that Church, vvhich is commonly counted the true Christian Church.

THEY say commonly, that although the diuel disguise him self neuer so much, yet by one marke or other, he bewrayeth him selfe. For altough sometymes he inuest him selfe in the habit of a young gallant, or of a mortifyed religious man: yea although in outward showe he transforme him selfa into an Angel of light, yet so it commontly happeneth, that by one marke or other he is discouered. For either his staring eyes, or stinking breath, or horned head, or forked feet, or base voice discryeth this gallant creature, to be not as he seemeth, but as he is in deed, a fowle & deformed feend: euen so the member of the diuel, that shrowdeth him selfe vnder the name of a christian, and wrappeth & pethlap him selfe frō top to toe, in the innocent habit of a Pastor, which is Scripture, and the vvord of God, yet by one marke or other, yea not by one only but by many, he descrieth him selfe to be as he is an heretike.

The diuel by one signe or other be vvrayeth him selfe.

So it hapneth to the heretike Vincent. Lyrin. l. contra proph. heres. uouit. c. 14.

2. And the reason is, because the counterfet neuer attayneth vnto the perfection of the currant, and art though she may imitate nature,

yet shal she alwayes be wanting in one thing or other. The counterfet gold of the Alchimistes hath a great resemblance vvith the true gold, but either the sound, or wayght or operation, vvil proue the old prouerbe to be true: that al is not gold that glistereth. *Zeuxis* painted grapes on a boyes head so liuely, that the byrds pecked at them, but yet art came short of nature, for if the boy had been painted as vvel as nature frameth her vvorkes, the byrds would not haue beene so imboldned: yea the grapes vvanted some thing, for at least by pecking, the byrds perceiued, that al is not grapes that seemeth so. Lysippus could in marble stone make so goodly a portrait of a man, that he would shew euery bone, vaine, and wrincle, vvith al proportion, but the vvant of life and motion wel declared, wherein art was enforced to yeeld to nature.

So the heretike be some marke or other is discryed.

3. Wherfore let the heretike counterfeit neuer so coningly, let him vse al the art possible to shew him selfe a sincere and true Christian, yet the counterfeit must come short of the currant, and art must yeeld to nature, and he in one point or other vvil bewray him self to be no true Christian, vvhich he professeth him selfe to be, but a faythles heretike which he would not seeme to be.

The reason.

Zeuxis.

The first marke of an heireke is his breach.

4 And the first mark by which he is bewrayed, is the breach he maketh out of the Church and Christian societie. For as the wandring sheepe was once of the fold, and the rebel was once a subiect, and the boow cut of once liued and florished in the tree: so heretikes especially Arch-heretikes, were for the most part, once sheep of Christes fold, subiectes of his kingdome, and members of his body the Church. Wherfore S Iohn giueth vs this mark to knovv an heretike by: *Ex nobis prodierunt, sed non erant ex nobis: They vvent out from vs, but they vvere not of vs.* That is, they liued amongst vs (for else they could not haue gone out) yet so, that they were not worthy our company, and therfore as rotten boowes are soone broken of, so they were soone shaken of, and took occasion to go from vs, vvho before for their euil life in deed were none of vs. Or else, to folow an other exposition, they vvere amongst vs in outvvard shew, because they frequented Sacraments with vs, but they vvere heretikes in mind and so none of vs, and therfore they vvent out from vs. They vvere in the Church but as euil humors in mans body, and therfore were to be expelled, because they were hurtful to the body, & no part of the substance. For commonly heretikes liue some time secret, before they open and disguise them selues, and so before they went out from vs openly, they were none

A similitude

1. *Io.* 2.

The first exposition.

The second. Aug. tract. 3. in ep. Io.

of vs

of vs ſecretly. Or elſe according to an other interpretation: they were once amongſt vs, and like true Chriſtianes liued vvith vs; but euen then when they vvere by preſent fayth and iuſtice members of our Church, God forſavv by his diuine forefight, that they vvould not continevv amongſt vs, and therfore they vvent out from vs, becauſe euen then when they were amongſt vs, they were none of vs finally, to perſeuer with vs: not that God his preſcience was the cauſe, but becauſe he forſaw which was to be, that they which were as yet of our ſocietie, were of their owne frie wil to leaue vs, & ſo in God his foreſight vvere finally none of our company. So that one euident marke of an heretike is, that he maketh, a breach out of the body of the Church, of which he either was, or ſemed to be a member. *The third.* *Aug. tract. 4. in Io.*

5. The ſame marke S. Paul giueth vs alſo to knowe an heretike, when he ſayeth, that *Some ſhal depart from the fayth, and that ſome are accuſtumed to forſake the aſſembly*, and that ſome *going out from vs, do truble others vvith vvords*. So the firſt Sacramentaries, I meane the Capharnaites, who vvould not beleeue that Chriſt could giue his body to be eaten, left Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and vvould vvalke no more vvith them. So that going out, or breaking forth of the Church, is a note and marke of an heretike. Wherfore Tertulian ſayth, that we muſt not meruaile nor think the worſe of our Church, when ſome do leaue vs, becauſe (ſayeth he) this ſheweth vs to be of the true Chriſtian company, according vnto that: *they vvent out from vs, but they vvere not of vs.* Yea he ſayth, that al heretikes vvere once Romaines in religion, and therfore now are heretikes, becauſe they ſeparate them ſelues as Marcion, and Valentinus did, of whom (ſayth he) it is certain, that they beleeued once as the Romain Church, vntil vnder Pope Eleutherius they were caſt out of the ſame. And this note is ſo certaine, that if you runne ouer the catalogue of al the ancient heretikes, you ſhal find that their heads, at leaſt, were al once members of that ſocietie, which was commonly called and counted Chriſtian, and when they left the ſame, they were by and by noted for rebels, runagates, and Apoſtataes. As the Scripture noteth the time and occaſion, vvhen the Samaritanes left the Temple of Hieruſalem, and vvould vvorſhip God no more in that place, as the Iewes euer had done. So haue Eccleſiaſtical hiſtories noted the time, & occaſion of the breach of euery Arch-heretike from the Church: and as yet vve vvel remember (it is not ſo long) the time and occaſion of Luthers reuolt from the Catholique and Romain Church. 1. *Tim.* 4. *Heb.* 10. *Act.* 15. *Io.* 6. *l. præſc.* 3. *Ibid. c.* 30. *Al Arch-heretikes vvere for the moſt part once Catholiques.* 3. *Reg.* 12. *Euſeb. Hiſt. Tripart. Geneb. Sander. Baron.*

yet shal she alwayes be wanting in one thing or other. The counterfet gold of the Alchimistes hath a great resemblance vvith the true gold, but either the sound, or wayght or operation, vvil proue the old prouerbe to be true: that al is not gold that glistereth. *Zeuxis* painted grapes on a boyes head so liuely, that the byrds pecked at them, but yet art came short of nature, for if the boy had been painted as vvel as nature frameth her vvorkes, the byrds would not haue beene so imboldned: yea the grapes vvanted some thing, for at least by pecking, the byrds perceiued, that al is not grapes that seemeth so. Lysippus could in marble stone make so goodly a portrait of a man, that he would shew euery bone, vaine, and wrincle, vvith al proportion, but the vvant of life and motion wel declared, wherein art was enforced to yeeld to nature.

So the heretike be some marke or other is discryed.

3. Wherfore let the heretike counterfeit neuer so coningly, let him vse al the art possible to shew him selfe a sincere and true Christian, yet the counterfeit must come short of the currant, and art must yeeld to nature, and he in one point or other vvil bewray him self to be no true Christian, vvhich he professeth him selfe to be, but a faythles heretike which he would not seeme to be.

The reason.

Zeuxis.

The first marke of an heretike is his breach.

4. And the first mark by which he is bewrayed, is the breach he maketh out of the Church and Christian societie. For as the wandring sheepe was once of the fold, and the rebel was once a subiect, and the boow cut of once liued and florished in the tree: so heretikes especially Arch-heretikes, were for the most part, once sheep of Christes fold, subiectes of his kingdome, and members of his body the Church. Wherfore S Iohn giueth vs this mark to know an heretike by: *Ex nobis prodierunt, sed non erant ex nobis: They vvent out from vs, but they vvere not of vs.* That is, they liued amongst vs (for else they could not haue gone out) yet so, that they were not worthy our company, and therfore as rotten boowes are soone broken of, so they were soone shaken of, and took occasion to go from vs, vvho before for their euil life in deed were none of vs. Or else, to folow an other exposition, they vvere amongst vs in outvvard shew, because they frequented Sacraments with vs, but they vvere heretikes in mind and so none of vs, and therfore they vvent out from vs. They vvere in the Church but as euil humors in mans body, and therfore were to be expelled, because they were hurtful to the body, & no part of the substance. For commonly heretikes liue some time secret, before they open and disguise them selues, and so before they went out from vs openly, they were none

A similitude

1. Io. 2.

The first exposition.

The second.

Aug. tract. 3. in ep. Io.

of vs

of vs ſecretly. Or elſe according to an other interpretation: they were once amongſt vs, and like true Chriſtianes liued vvith vs, but euen then when they vvere by preſent fayth and iuſtice members of our Church, God forſavv by his diuine foreſight, that they vvould not continevv amongſt vs, and therfore they vvent out from vs, becauſe euen then when they were amongſt vs, they were none of vs finally, to perſeuer with vs: not that God his preſcience was the cauſe, but becauſe he forſaw which was to be, that they which were as yet of our ſocietie, were of their owne frie wil to leaue vs, & ſo in God his foreſight vvere finally none of our company. So that one euident marke of an heretike is, that he maketh, a breach out of the body of the Church, of which he either was, or ſemed to be a member. *The third.* *Aug. tract. 4. in Io.*

5. The ſame marke S. Paul giueth vs alſo to knowe an heretike, when he ſayeth, that *Some ſhal depart from the fayth, and that ſome are accuſtumed to forſake the aſſembly*, and that ſome *going out from vs, do truble others vvith vvords*. So the firſt Sacramentaries, I meane the Capharnaites, who vvould not beleeue that Chriſt could giue his body to be eaten, left Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and vvould vvalke no more vvith them. So that going out, or breaking forth of the Church, is a note and marke of an heretike. Wherfore Tertulian ſayth, that we muſt not meruaile nor think the worſe of our Church, when ſome do leaue vs, becauſe (ſayeth he) this ſheweth vs to be of the true Chriſtian company, according vnto that: *they vvent out from vs, but they vvere not of vs.* Yea he ſayth, that al heretikes vvere once Romaines in religion, and therfore now are heretikes, becauſe they ſeparate them ſelues as Marcion, and Valentinus did, of whom (ſayth he) it is certain, that they beleeued once as the Romain Church, vntil vnder Pope Eleutherius they were caſt out of the ſame. And this note is ſo certaine, that if you runne ouer the catalogue of al the ancient heretikes, you ſhal find that their heads, at leaſt, were al once members of that ſocietie, which was commonly called and counted Chriſtian, and when they left the ſame, they were by and by noted for rebels, runagates, and Apoſtataes. As the Scripture noteth the time and occaſion, vvhen the Samaritanes left the Temple of Hieruſalem, and vvould vvorſhip God no more in that place, as the Iewes euer had done. So haue Eccleſiaſtical hiſtories noted the time, & occaſion of the breach of euery Arch-heretike from the Church: and as yet vve vvel remember (it is not ſo long) the time and occaſion of Luthers reuolt from the Catholique and Romain Church. *1. Tim. 4. Heb. 10. Act. 15. Io. 6.* *l. præſc. 3.* *Ibid. c. 30.* *Al Arch-heretikes vvere for the moſt part once Catholiques.* *3. Reg. 12.* *Euſeb. Hiſt. Tripart. Geneb. Sander. Baron.*

Alphonsus Castro. Philostr. Pratolus. in c. 1. ep. Gal.

6 Yea him selfe confesseth that once he was a Papist, and that in the highest degree, for these words he once vttered in his commentaries vpon the first Epistle to the Galathians: *si quisquam alius, certè ego ante lucem Euangely pie sensi & zelaui pro Papisticis legibus, & patrum traditionibus, easque magno serio vt sanctas, & earum obseruationem tanquam necessariam ad salutem vrsi, & defendi: If euer any, truly I, before the light of the Gospel* (he meaneth his owne Gospel) *thought holily, and was Zealous for the Papisticall lawes, and the fathers traditions, and I vrged and defended them, as holie, and their obseruation as necessarie to salutation.* Yea he confesseth how he

Ibidem.

watched, fasted, prayed, and tamed his body when he was a friar: yea sayeth he: *Tanta erat authoritas Papæ apud me, vt vel in minimo dissentire ab ipso, putarem crimen æterna damnatione dignum: So great was the Popes authoritie with me, that I thought it a crime worthy eternal damnation, to dissent from him in the least point. Yea once,* sayth he, *I was so Zealous for the Pope, that I thought*

Ibidem.

Ihon Husse a wicked heretike, and would haue burnt him with my owne handes. And as Luther was, so were al the packe of their first fathers, children of our mother the Catholique Church: and sithence they are gone out, they weare the badge and cognisaunce of heretikes.

Their answer that our Church was corrupted before they left it. The refutatiõ.

7. They will answer peraduenture, that we were not the true Church, but were long before metamorphized, and changed into the synagogue of the diuil, and that therfore it was time for them to leaue vs But if we were degenerated, I demand of them, when, vnder what Pope, or Emperour, and in what age, and from what Church did we degenerate, out of what Church did we make a breach? for nothing degenerateth, but from that which it was before. And if they can not tel vs when we begun to degenerate, nor from what Church, then can they not put this marke vpon vs. Yea I shal in this booke proue, that our Church which now is, agreeth with the Church,

Chap. 5.

which in al ages euen from the Apostles, was counted the only Christian Church. Neither is it sufficient to say, that we were not the true

Euerie heretike may say that it was not the true church which they left.

Church, for so Arius, Nestorius, Eutiches, and euery heretike was accustomed to say, who notwithstanding because they went forth of that Church, which was commonly called and counted the Christian Church, were counted heretikes.

8. Yea although the Church had bene ouergrowne with errors, yet can not that excuse them from being heretikes, because in their opinion, the Church may stand with errors, and so they are heretikes, for leauing it as al ready is proued. Caluin confesseth that the Church of the Iewes was obscured with many errors, & that yet the prophets

Esaie,

Esaie, Hieremie, Ioel, Abacuc and the rest, would not forsake the Synagogue, nor erect altar against altar, but rather remained in the church to reprehend abuses. Yea he saith, that the Church of the Corinthians, and Galathians, was corrupted in faith and doctrine, and yet S. Paul would not forsake them. To be briefe, he confesseth that the Church ouer vvhich (as he sayth) the Pope tyrannizeth, is stil the true Church, though it be prophaned. Monsieur du plessis also (more famous for his foyle vvhich that learned Bishop and worthy Cardinal Monsieur d'Eureux gaue him, in detecting his false allegations, then for any vertue or solid learning) defining vvhat the Church is, saith that it is a Congregation of the faithful vvhich beleeue in God by Iesus Christ. And explicating this his Definition, he saith, that the formal cause of the Church, and that vvhich giueth it being and essence, is the belefe in Christ, and inuocation of him. And then he addeth, that although the Church be couered vvith a thousand errors, yet if she retain this inuocation of Christ, she remaineth the true Church, euen as a man couered with sores ceaseth not to be a man, so long as he enioyeth one threed of life. Yea (saith he) I wil admit the Romain Church to be the true Church (as he needs must by his former definition, because the Romain Church beleeueth in Christ, & calleth vpon him) so that it be granted me, that she is corrupted, I wil acknowledge her the spouse of Christ, so that it be confessed, that she is also an aduoutaresse. And herin they folow their first Patriarch Luther, who once vttered these wordes of the Romain Church: we confesse that there is in Papacie much christian goodnes, yea al christian goodnes, and that from thence it is come to vs: to witte, we confesse in Papacie to be the true Scripture, true Baptisme, the true Sacrament of the Altar, true Keyes for remission of sinners, true Ministerie of the word etc. I confesse truly that vnder the Pope is true christianitie, and many good men indewed wtih excellent sanctitie. But this confession hangeth them. For if the Romain Church notvvistanding errors (as they say) remaine stil the true Church, then are they heretikes, vvho haue left her, and made a breach from her, ad haue set vp a new Altar and a new Misterie, and a new Synagogue against her.

l. 4. c. 17. & 18 & 19. & c. 2

l. 4 c. 1.

En son traicté de l'Eglise.

Ep. ad duos pastores to. 2. Germ.

9. Sith therfore Luther, Caluin, & the rest haue departed from our Church, vvhich vvas and stil is called the Christian Church, either they are heretikes, or else Arius, Nestorius, yea Simon Magus, Cerinthus, and Ebion were no heretiks

10. Neither can they instly bragge that many haue left them also,

See the 6. ch. and ſeuered them ſelues from their company: for that vvas alwayes the maner of heretikes, not long to continew in one religion, but to diuide them ſalues into many Sectes. And if they count thoſe heretikes, who goe from them & make new Sectes, then are they al euen the firſt of them, heretikes, becauſe the firſt of them vvent out of vs.

11. Wherfore in few words to compriſe al, and to conclude which I intended, They can not name the Church, from vvhich we departed, nor the time, nor the occaſion. But we tel vvhen they departed, & from vvhat Church, that is the Romain Church, which vvas and is ſtil commonly counted the true Chriſtian Church. And ſo it foloweth euidently, that we are ſtil in the right Church, becauſe there was neuer any other, out of which we could breake forth, they are runne out, we weare the badge of true Chriſtianes, which is neuer to goe out, neuer to forſake that vvhich once we haue profeſſed: they weare the badge and are noted with the marke of heretikes, vvhich is to goe out, and to forſake the common receiued Church. And ſo if euer there were any heretikes ſo called, and counted, for breaking forth, and going out, then are theſe heretikes, and neuer ſhal be able to hide this marke, goe they neuer ſo diſguiſedly.

The Concluſion.

The ſecond Chapter diſcouereth the ſecond marke of an heretike, vvhich is later ſtanding and noueltie, vvhich alſo is proued to agree as fitly to the Goſpellers of this tyme, as to any heretikes of former tymes.



GOOD goeth before bad, truth before falſhood, the currant before the counterfet, and nature before art: becauſe euil is but a priuation of the good, & falſhood is that vvhich ſwerueth from the truth, & the counterfet is but reſemblance of the currant, and art is but an imitation of nature; and ſo theſe come after, thoſe of neceſſitie muſt goe before.

2. No meruayle then if religion take the precedence of ſuperſtition, and Chriſtian fayth of hereſie, which is but a priuation of good, a falſitie ſweruing from truth, a conterfet reſemblance of currant, and an artificial imitation of Chriſtian ſinceritie. Religion vvas planted be-

ted before superstition tooke roote, vertue vvas rooted before vice was sowne, and the seed of true fayth was sowne, before the enemie scattered the euil cockle of heresie: and as the true Apostles liued and preached before Simon Magus, and other false prophetes his successors: so true fayth vvas sowne, rooted, and come to some height and ripenes, before euer the false Apostles scattered the nettleseed, of their heresies. Yea not only by the Apostles generally in the world, but also by their successors particularly in euery particular country, fayth grew and florished before heresie was sowne, for as Bozius in his fourth booke of the signes of the Church learnedly proueth, the first conuersion of euery country from Paganisme vnto Christianitie, vvas not to heresie, but to the true fayth and Romain religion: and vvhen that was receiued, then heresie being but a corruption of true fayth, as vineger is of wine, began to take place, then the cockle sprong vp after the good corne. And therfore S. Paul giueth vs this marke to know an heretike, and heresie, that they arise after the true religion. *I knovv* (saith he) *that rauening vvolues* (*that is he etikes*) *after my departure shal enter amongst you not sparinge the flocke*. So that after S. Paul had preached and perswaded true fayth, the false prophetes entered, to ruine the spiritual building vvhich he had framed.

Religion before superstition and heresie. *Mat. 13.* *In euerie countrie Cath. religion before heresie.* *Boz. l. 4.* *Act. 20.*

3. In like maner the ancient Fathers haue euer noted heretikes and their heresies of later standing and noueltie. *In al things* (sayth Tertulian) *the veritie goeth before the image, and last of al cometh the similitude.* Yea, sayth, he, it is a folly to thinke, that heresie in doctrin is the first, especially seing that the true religion fortelleth heresies. And in an other place, thus he concludeth: *In summa, si constat id verius quod prius, id prius quod est ab initio, ab initio quod ab Apostolis, pariter vtique constabit, id esse ab Apostolis traditum, quod apud Ecclesias Apostolicas fuerit sacrosanctum. In brieef, if it be manifest, that that is truest, vvhich is first, that first vvhich is from the beginning, that from the beginning, vvhich is from the Apostles, it shal lickvvise be manifest that that is deliuered by the Apostles vvhich hath been inuiolably holden in the apostolical Churches.* And in his booke against Praxeas he sayth, that it is adiudged against al heresies, that that is true vvhich is first, that is counterfet vvhich is later. And this he sheweth by a similitude, for (sayeth he) as the wild oliue springeth often tymes out of the sweet oliue nutte, and the wild figtree out of the good figge, so heresies haue growne out of our ground, vvhich yet are not ours, degenerating from the true graine of fayth. Ireneus also subscribeth to Tertulians opinion in these vvords: *Omnes illi valde posteriores sunt quam Episcopi,*

l. præsc. c. 29. 30. *li. 4. aduersus Marcionem.* *l. aduers. praeam.* *l. præse. c. 36.*

l. 5. circa medium. *Episcopi, quibus Apostoli tradiderunt Ecclesias. Althey* (he meaneth heretikes) *are of much later standing then the Bishops, to vvhom the Apostles committed the Churches.* And as heretikes are noted of later standing, so

l. 1. c. 14. is their doctrin counted to sauour of noueltie. Wherfore Zozomenus sayeth that Arius was not afrayed to affirme, that vvhich neuer any durst auouch, to wit, that God the Sonne vvas created of nothing.

The Cath. Church keepeth the olde. 4. And Vincentius Lyrinensis vvriting a booke against heresies, intitleth it: Against prophane noueltie, and vviſely obſerueth that the Catholique Church kepeth the old, and deuiſeth no new doctrin: to

Vincent l. con. proph. hæresũ Nouit. c. 27. vvhich ſenſe he explicateth thoſe vvordes of S. Paul: *O Timothee depoſitum cuſtodi O Timothie kepe that vvhich vvas depoſed vvith thee, and committed to thy cuſtodie: Depoſitum cuſtodi* (ſayeth he) *non quod à te inuentum, ſed quod*

1. Tim. 6. *tibi creditum eſt, quod accepiſti, non quod excogitaſti, rem non ingenij, ſed doctrinæ, non vſurpationis priuatæ, ſed publicæ traditionis, in qua non author eſſe debes, ſed cuſtos, non inſtitutor, ſed ſectator, aurum accepiſti, aurum redde, nolo mihi pro aliis alia ſubijcias.* Kepe that vvhich is depoſed, not vvhich is innented by thee, but vvhich is committed to thee, vvhich thou haſt receiued, not vvhich thou haſt deuiſed, a thing not of wit, but of doctrine, not of priuat vſurpation, but of publique tradition, in vvhich thou oughteſt not to be an autor, but a keeper, not an inſtitutor but a folower, thou receiuedſt gold, reſtore gold, I wil not haue thee put in one thing for an other.

5. Wherein he putteth a playne difference betwixt Catholiques and heretikes; that they ſticke to the old, theſe are euer deuiſing new

Faith is ſtil the ſame though it be more explicated. doctrin. For although the Church by new Councels and definitions addeth greater explication of her religion, and although by the laborious endeuors of the Doctors of the Church, which in no age are wãting, many points of our fayth are more illuſtrated & dilated, yet in

2. 2. q. 1. a. 7. ſubſtance our fayth is ſtil one and the ſame. And therfore Diuines ſay, that fayth neuer from the beginning hath increaſed in ſubſtance, but only in explication, and that the Church ſince the time of the Apoſtles, neuer had new reuelations in the Articles of beleef, and that in general Councels ſhe defineth no new things, but rather thoſe things vvhich before were extant in Scriptures, Fathers, or Tradition, ſhe by her definition, declareth more certainly, and propoſeth more plainly to the vew of the world.

A fit ſimilitude. 6. So that as Vincentius Lyrinenſis ſayth, euen as mans body increaſeth by nutrition and augmentation, yet gayneth no new limmes and members, but only getteth more quantitie and ſtrength in the former, ſo

mer, ſo Chriſtian fayth by no increaſe did euer yet gaine newv Articles, but only hath gotten greater and clearer explication of the former. Vvherfore the ſame Doctor counſayleth euery preacher and teacher, ſo to explicate thinges after a newv maner, that he preach not newv doctrin: *Eadem quæ accepiſti* (ſayeth he) *ita doce, vt cùm dicas nouè, non dicas noua* c. 27. *The ſame things vvhich thou haſt receiued, ſo do thou teach, that vvhen thou ſpeakeſt after a newv maner, thou ſpeake no newv things.*

7. And the reaſon vvhy fayth admitteth no noueltie is this: because God ſpeaketh once, and neuer recalleth or amendeth his word: and in him that prouerb taketh no place: *Secunda conſilia meliora, ſecond counſayls are the beſt.* For God is as vviſe and circumſpect at the firſt as at the laſt, & therfore he having once reuealed and planted fayth, that muſt ſtand for good, and he that ſeeketh to change, declareth him ſelfe a corrupter, not a correcter: and in that he commeth after vvith his deuiſing vvit to adde, or detract from the olde receiued faith, he bewrayeth him ſelfe to be of later ſtanding, and ſo an heretike, and his doctrin to ſauour of noueltie, & ſo to be an hereſie. *The reaſon.* *Iob 33.* *Pſal. 61.*

8. Vvherfore to conclude, ſith it is certaine, that Catholiques, vvhom they cal Papiſts, are of no late ſtanding, nor anie vpſtarts, (for I demand vvhen they beganne, and after vvhom they aroſe?) they can be no heretikes, and ſeing that it is no leſſe certain, that the reformers of this time be al nouellants, and nouellers, vpſtarts, and of later ſtanding, ariſing many hundred yeares after the Romain Church, vvhich vvas euer counted the only true Church (for Luther the firſt of al this newv frye and his religion is not yet an hundred yeares old) it is as certaine, that they are heretikes, and their religion hereſie, as that Arius, Neſtorius, Pelagius, vvere heretikes: and the ſame Fathers and Scriptures before alleaged, vvhich haue condemned them for heretikes, becauſe of their late ſtanding, can not without plaine partialitie, frie our reformers from the ſame ſentence, who weare the ſame badge, & are noted vvith the ſame marke of an heretike, vvhich is later ſtanding. *The concluſion.*

The third Chapter noteth the Reformers vvith an other marke of an heretike, vvhich is a particular name, taken from their Sectmaster.

Psal.7. Sap. 1. Th 1.p. q.57. art. 4. The secrecie of the harte.

THE hart of man is a secret closet, of which God only keepeth the key, it is a bottomles pit, which he only who searcheth the hart and reines, can sound to the bottom: in so much that vnles God reueale, or this hart of man vouchsafe to open it selfe, neither diuel nor Angel can discouer the hartes cogitations, much lesse can one man know vvhat an other thinketh. Wherfore, that mē might impert their thoughts one to an other, God hath geuen them a tongue as an Interpreter of the mind, & a messenger of the thoughts, & a mouth also as a trumpet, wherin the tōgue soundeth forth by voice, vvhat the hart thinketh. And because the things which we would speak of, can not by them selues immediately be brought into discourse, the tongue frameth words & giueth names, vvhich goe for the things, that so vvhen vve heare the sound of the word & name, we may vnderstand the thing which is spoken of.

The tongue is the interpretour of the harte. Names God for thinges.

2. Wherfore the new Christians of this time must not meruail, that by their name, as by an infallible marke, I seek to discouer them: for names are Symboles and signes, by which we know the natures of things, together with their proprieties. But what, wil you say, is this name, by which they are conuinced to be heretikes? it is the Surname which they take from their Sect-master, by which they were alwayes more famous, then by their proper names.

By names vve knovv the thinges. The name by vvhich an heretike is knovven.

3. At the first when al Christianes were of one hart and lippe, beleeuing and professing the same names, as Christianes of Christ, brethren for their mutual charitie, faithful in respect of one fayth. But vvhen certain in constant and deuising heads, would vary from the rest of the faythful incertain pointes of religion, their names changed as they them selues vvere altered, & because they novv beganne to leaue the common receiued fayth, which Christ by him selfe and his Apostles, and their successors had deliuered, they were no more called by the common name of Christianes, but by the name by which their

At first one name vvas common to al Christians. VVhen Christians vvere called by particuler names.

Autour

Autour vvas called, who deuiſed their religion: and therfore as in fayth they were ſeparated from other Chriſtians, ſo in names alſo vvhich explicate the natures of things, they were of neceſſitie ſeuered. Simoniãs were named of Simon Magus, the Ebionites of Ebion, Marcionites of Marcion, the Manichies of Manicheus, the Arrians of Arrius, Neſtorians of Neſtorius, Eutichianes of Eutiches, Pelagians of Pelagius, Donatiſts of Donatus, vvho notvvithſtanding before they varyed in religion, and folovved nevv Maſters, vvere called only by the common names of Chriſtians, and ſo the ancient Fathers euer condemned them as heretikes, vvho vvere marked vvith theſe particular names. *Names of ſectemaſters.*

4. S. Hierome pronounceth boldly this ſentence: *Sicubi audieris eos qui dicuntur Chriſtiani, non à Domino Ieſu Chriſto, ſed à quopiam alio nuncupari, vtpote Marcionitas, Valentinianos, Montenſes, &c. ſcito non Eccleſiam Chriſti, ſed Anti-Chriſti eſſe Synagogam: If any vvhere thou heare of them vvho are called Chriſtians, yet take their name not of Ieſus Chriſt, but of ſome other, as for example, if they be called Marcionits, Valentinians, Montaniſts, &c. Knov thou, that there is not the Church of Chriſt, but the Synagogue of Anti-Chriſt.* Iuſtinus Martyr diſcrieth heretikes by the ſame badge and marke: *There are* (ſayeth he) *and euer vvere many, vvhich come in the name of Ieſus, yet are called by diuers Surnames, as Marcionits, Valentinians, Baſilidians, Saturninians euerie one borovving a name of the firſt inuentor of their doctrin.* Of ſuch kind of men this is S. Ciprianes opinion: *They vvhich vvere once Chriſtians, novv Nouatians, are novv no more Chriſtians, becauſe* (ſayeth he) *primam fidem veſtram perfidia poſteriori, per nominis appellationem mutaſtis: you haue changed your former fayth, for a later infidelitie, by the appellation of of your name.* *li. contra Lucifer. in fine.* *Dial. cum Triphone.* *Ep. ad Nouat. hereticum.*

5. And the reaſon vvhy theſe Fathers accounted always ſuch nicknamed perſons as heretikes, is eaſily ſene; becauſe ſuch as leaue the Church and wil not heare her voice, were always eſtemed as heretikes, as the Greeke vvord *Hereſis* importeth, which ſignifieth election and ſeparation. And therfore S. Auſtin and S. Ciprian put this difference betwixt an heretike and a ſchiſmatike, that although both do ſeparate them ſelues from the Church, yet a ſchiſmatike only is diuided in vvil, contumacie, and breach of charitie: an heretike in fayth alſo and opinion, and therfore ſeing that theſe diuerſe names taken from diuerſe Autors, argue ſuch a ſeparation (for if they had ſtil remained in that Church, vvhich commonly vvas called Chriſtian, and had not folowed newmaſters, there had needed no diſtinction of names from other Chriſtians) it muſt needs folow, that al ſuch as are diſtinguiſhed *Mat. 18.* *Li. 2. contra. Fauſt. c. 1.* *Cip. l. 1. ep. 6.*

thus in name from other Christians, are diuided also from them in fayth and religion, and so are no true Christians, but perfidious heretikes.

6. I demand now of our Lutheranes, Zuingliannes, Caluinistes, Osiandrians, Bezists, Brownists, Martinists, & such like new-named Christians of this age, whether they dare stand to the sentence of Iustinus Martyr, S Cyprian, and S. Hierom in this point? Truly I think they dare not: and I thinke also that they haue good cause: for if that they be heretikes which are surnamed of particular autors (as they plainly affirme) if our new Christianes be so surnamed, as al the world vvil be vvitnes that they are, then must needs folow this conclusion, that they also are heretikes.

The Conclusion.

7. But to conclude more plainly that which was intended. This marke of an heretike can in no wise agree to Catholiques, but rather to them agreeth the signe of the true Christians. For as in the time of the Arians, they vvere counted true Christians, vvhich vvere called by general names, Christians, and Catholiques, and they vvere esteemed of as heretikes, which had particular names deriued from the autour of their Sect, as Arians, AErians, Eudoxians, and such like: so now vve that are called by the same names of Catholiques and Christians, and by no name taken from other autor, must needs be taken for true Christians, vvho as vve neuer changed name, so neuer changed religion, and the reformers vvho are called Lutheranes, Caluinistes, Zuinglians and such like, of some particular Sect-master or other, must needs be condemned for heretikes.

8. And as before that the ancient heretikes forsooke the common receiued faith, they vvent by the common names of Christians, and Catholiques, and neuer tooke vnto them particular names, before they folowed particular maisters, and imbraced particular doctrines, so before Luther and Caluin reuolted from the Church, they vvent by the common name of Christians, and neuer changed their names, til they changed their religion, neither vvere any Christians called Lutheranes, Caluinistes, or such like, before they relyed vpon new and particular masters.

9. And as the Arians, because they could impose no name of any autour to the Catholique Christians, were fayne to cal them Homousians, of their doctrine, as before them they were called *Psichiki*, that is carnal, for defending second mariages against Tertulian and the Montanistes: so at this time our reformers are fayne to cal Catholiques

liques Papistes, for holding the supremacie of the Pope, who is no new autor of any new religion, but ancient Successor of S. Peter, and Vicare of Christ.

10. As for the names of Thomists, & Scotists, they are no names of autors of new religion, because al held the same fayth, but of autors of some other new opinions or maners of teaching in Philosophie, and schoole pointes: likewise the names Benedictins, Dominicanes, Franciscanes, are names deriued from autors of new states of life, but not of new faith or religion. So that in vs whom they cal Papistes, is no name which argueth vs to be heretikes. In the reformers are particular names of particular autors of new pointes of religion, and so they weare the caracter of the beast, and are infamous heretikes, if Montanus, Marcion, Arius, were worthily called heretikes.

The fourth Chapter discouereth an other marke of an heretike, which is a renouation of old heresies, which argueth these reformers to be heretikes, if euer any were iustly so counted.

MANY there are in the world, who finding many absurdities in the new religion, and yet some difficulties also in the old, will neither hold altogether with the one nor the other: but comfort them selues with a flattering opinion, that a Christian may be saued in al religions, so that he retain the principal articles of Christian beleef. For (say they) if he be firmly grounded in a right fayth of the Incarnation, & Trinitie, perswading him self that God is one in essence and three in persones, and that Christ is one in person, yet subsisting in two natures, that he suffred for man kind, and is the Messias and Sauiour of the world; he is a Christian good ynough, whatsoeuer his opinion be in lesse matters, as iustification, merit, Sacraments, and such like: which to them be but petie matters, and not of such importance, as that a mans saluation should depend theron. *Many thinke to be saued in any religion.*

2. But this opinion of theirs, would they neuer so fayne that it were true, is most vntrue, and as false as flattering. And the reason is,

A false and flattering opinion.

because one only opinion in a matter of fayth, obstinately defended against the Churches authoritie, is sufficient to dismember a Christian from the mystical body of Christ his holy Church, in that it depriueth him of infused fayth, vvhich is the glew, yea the sinew that vniteth the members of this body together. And in dede as yet we neuer heard of an heretike, but he professed some principal parts of Christian faith: as that Christ vvas God and man, or the Reedemer of mankind, or the autour of the law of grace, or some such like: for if he altogether denyed Christ, he was rather an Apostata then an heretike. For he is an heretike, vvho professeth Christ in some sorte, and him selfe also a Christian, yet obstinately denyeth some part of Christian religion: and he is an Apostata, vvho quitte renounceth Christ and his religion. Wherfore vnles vve wil grant, that al heretikes may be saued, we must needs confesse, that one heresie is sufficient to damne a man perpetually.

The reason.

Th. 2. 2. q. 5. a. 3. & 3. p. q. 8. a. 3.

One heresie sufficient to dismember vs from the body of the Church.

Euerie heretike professeth Christ.

3. But in this matter lest my censure seme to rigorous, and my sentence to seuere, I wil alleage Scripture, vvhich can not deceiue vs, if they be rightly vnderstood. Our Sauiour Christ denounceth him to be like an Ethnike and Publicane, vvhich wil not heare the Church, and sayth not, who wil not giue credit vnto her in principal matters, but absolutely he sayeth, if he wil not heare the Church, let him be vnto thee as an Ethnike and Publicane, that is shunne his company as the Iewes did al familiaritie with paganes & publicanes. And again Christ threatneth that he, *vvho beleeueth not shal be damned.* To which agreeth S. Paul saying *that vvithout fayth, it is impossible to please God.* meaning no doubt a vvhole and entier fayth, deuoid of al errors. For else al heretikes may be saued, vvho beleue some parts of Christian beleef. Wherfore S. Paul amongst the workes of the flesh, that is of a man vvhich foloweth not the spirit of God, but his owne sensualitie and liking, reckeneth not only fornication, drunkennes, murder, and idolatrie, but also dissensions, sectes, and heresies, and against al these workes he pronounceth the sentence of damnation: *I fortel you as I haue fortold you, that they vvhich do such things shal not obtein the Kingdom of heauen:* which sentence as he would haue pronounced against one fornication, or murder, so would he against one heresie. To this agreeth Athanasius in his Creed saying, that vnles a Christian Kepe intierly and inuiolately the Catholique fayth, he can not be saued. Which to me seemeth a sufficient argument, that one only heresie is a sufficient matter of condemnation.

The differēce betvvixt an heretike and an Apostata.

Mat. 18.

Mar. 16.

Heb. 11.

An intier faith is necessarie.

Gal. 5.

Heresie a vvorke of the flesh.

One heresie damneth as one fornication.

Symb. Atha.

4. And

4. And truly if we wil looke backe to ancient tymes, and take a veiw of Eccleſiaſtical hiſtories and councels, vve ſhal find, that for ſome few errors, yea ſometymes for one only, & that not in the principal points of our beleef, many haue been accuſed and condemned for heretikes. Pelagius beleued that there were three diuine perſons, æqual, coæqual, and conſubſtantial: he profeſſed that Chriſt was God and man, & the Sauiour of the world, and that by his grace we might more eaſily come to heauen: yet becauſe that he auerred that without this grace we might keep the commandements, and withal, that litle infants were neither conceiued nor borne in original ſinne, he was by the common voice of the Church and Chriſtian vvorld, condemned for an heretike. Vigilantius beleued alſo the Trinitie and Incarnation, and yet for that he condemned, and contemned reliques, vigilles, lighting of candels in the Church, prayer to Saynts, and æqualized matrimony with virginitie, S. Hierom condemneth him euen vnto hel. Iouinian alſo for making al ſinnes, and good vvorkes, equal in demerit and merit, and for putting no difference betwixt the ſtate of Virgins and the Maried, was by the ſame Doctor condemned for an heretike: ro vvhich his ſentence al the chriſtian vvorld ſubſcribed.

Heretikes accurſed, vvhich yet beleeued in Chriſt.
Pelagius.
Poſid. in vita Aug.
Vigilantius.
l. con Vigil.
lib con. Iouin.

5. And no meruaile. For if one hereſie depriueth vs of fayth as it doth, becauſe he that beleueth not God, and his Church in one article, beleueth them in none, if fayth be the linke which vniteth vs as members to the myſtical body of Chriſts Church, then one hereſie is ſufficient to ſeparate vs from the Church, as the very name in Grecke *Hereſis* importeth, & conſequently one hereſie is ynough to damne vs, becauſe out of the Church is no ſaluation. For as the arme cut of dyeth, and the boow riuen from the tree withereth: ſo whether by one or many hereſies we be ſeparated from Chriſts myſtical body, vvhich he viuificateth by his ſpirit, we dye and vvither, and remain deuoid of life, ſappe, and ſaluation, becauſe the ſpirit of God, vvhich is as it were the ſoule and ſpirit of this body, imparteth it ſelfe to none, but thoſe vvho by true fayth are members of this body, and boowes of this tree, vvhich extendeth it ſelfe, by reaching boowes from ſea to ſea.

Th. 2. 2. q. 5. a. 3.
A reaſon vvhy one hereſie condemneth.
A fit ſimilitude.
Pſal. 79.

6. Wherfore S. Cyprian ſayeth, that *vvhoſoeuer is ſeparated from the Church, hath no part in Chriſtes promiſes: he is an alian* (ſayeth he) *an enemie, a prophane perſon, and one that can not haue God for his father, vvho hath not the Church for his mother.* Yea (ſaith he) *ſuch an one may dye for Chriſt, he may burne, he may be caſt to the vvild beaſtes, but that death shal be no crovvne of fayth but a pain of infidelitie: ſuch a one may be killed, but he can not be crovvned.*

L. de Vnit. Eccleſie.
No Saluation out of the Chuch.
Ibidem.

7. Pacia-

Ep. 2. ad Sympron.

7. Pacianus casteth Nouatian out of the Church, for only denying Confirmation, the Sacrament of Penance, and opposing himself to Pope Cornelius, & telleth him that he can not be saued though he dye for Christ. *Porro* (sayth he) *etiam si passus est aliquid Nouatianus, non tamen etiam occisus, etiam si occisus, non tamen coronatus. Quid ni. Extra Ecclesiæ pacem, extra concordiam, extra eam matrem, cuius portio debet esse qui Martyr est.* But although Nouatian hath suffred something yet he vvas not killed, although he vvere killed, yet not crowned. Why not? Out of the Churches peace, out of her concord, out of that mother, whose portion he must be, that is a Martyr.

Lib. de hæres. ad Quod vult Deum in fine.

Wherfore S. Austin, hauing rehearsed fowre score heresies, saith that there may be manie moe heresies of lesse moment vnknowen to him, and of the least of them this terrible sentence he pronounceth: *quarum aliquam quisquis tenuerit, Christianus Catholicus non erit.* Of vvhich heresies, Whosoeuer shal hold any one, shal not be a Christian Catholique. And I wil adde, that consequently he can not be saued, becaute out of the Catholique Church is no Saluation, as is already proued in this Chapter, and in the seuenth Chapter folowing. And so a man can not be saued in al faithes and religions, because one heresie curteth him from the Church out of which is no Saluation, and against one heresie, as before, S Paul would haue pronounced the sentence of damnation, as wel as against one fornication. And so Foxe is a foxe, vvho in his lying historie to shew a continual succession of his visible Church, raketh vp Waldenses, Albigenses, Wiclefists, Lollards, Hussites and such other damned heretikes, making them members of one Church, to make vp a body of his pretended Church. For first the Church of Christ should be a monstrous body compacted of so many diuers, and so vnlike partes and members, and should be as ridiculous as the Poets Picture, vvhich had a mans head, a hortes neck, a fowles body, and a fishes taile. Secondly if one heresie be sufficient to cut a man cleane from the Church (as I haue proued that it is) then certes these heretiks vvhich so disagreed amongst them selues could not be members of one true Church, as neither can our Protestantes, Puritanes, Brownists, & others in England; and therfore though they may be damned, because they haue cut them selues from the Romain Church, vvhich this booke proueth to be the true Church, yet can they not possibly al be saued. And so Foxe also is a foxe in compiling a Kalendar of Martyrs, Confessors, and Saints of many and diuers sectes, vvho like Sampsons foxes agreed only in the taile against the Romain Church,

Supra.

Saluation not possible in al relig ions.

Supra.

In his protest. to the church of England.

The first reason.

For his church is monstrous.

Horat. Flac. de art Poetica the Second reason.

but

but neither in head nor body. For if one hereſie be ſufficient to cut a man quite of from the Church militant in earth, it muſt needs cut him alſo from the Church triumphant in heauen: and ſo though diuers heretikes may be al damned, and be al members of one damned crue in hel, yet can they not be al ſaued, neither can they al be Saints and Citizens of one heauen, and conſequently are moſt abſurdly & fooliſhly put in one Kalendar. If then it be ſo that one error in faith obſtinately defended, is ſufficient to cut a man from the Church, & to make him an heretike; then certes the Goſpellers of this time, muſt needs be heretikes, and that in the higheſt degree, who haue renewed almoſt al the old hereſies, and euen thoſe vvhich by the Chriſtian vvorld, were alwayes condemned for damnable errors.

The nevv Chriſtians vvho renevv old hereſies muſt needs be heretikes.

8 For if Simon Magus and his ſucceſſors were euer heretikes for ſuch and ſuch opinions, if theſe men wil defend the ſame opinions, they muſt needs be condemned for heretikes alſo, vnles we wil vſe plaine & palpable partialitie. Simon Magus ſayed, that God was the autor of ſinne, whom Cerdon and Marcion, Manicheus, Photinus, and Blaſtus folowed, & were for this doctrine, by the common voice of the Chriſtian world, adiudged heretikes. And ſhal not the ſame ſentence paſſe vpon our reformers, who ſay not only (as Simon Magus did) that God by a certaine conſequence is the autor of ſinne, in that he hath giuen man a nature neceſſarily inclining to ſinne, but affirme alſo that he directly moueth to ſinne, yea prouoketh vs, and eggeth vs forward? Shal Manicheus and the others aboue named be heretikes, vvho ſayed only, that the euil God was autor of ſinne (for they imagined tvvo Gods) & ſhal our reformers be counted good Chriſtiãs, vvho ſay that the good and the only God is the cauſe and Promotor of al lies and wickednes? Certain old heretikes euen in the Apoſtles time, grounding them ſelues vpon S. Paules Epiſtle to the Romaines, which as S. Peter witneſſeth, they did wrongly interpret, affirmed only fayth to be ſufficient to ſaluation (which phantaſie Simon Magus, and Eunomius alſo imbraced, and for this they were accurſed for heretikes) and ſhal Luther and Caluin, and their adherentes go for ſincere Chriſtians, who teach the ſelfe ſame doctrin? Leo the third Emperour, Conſtantine the fifth, and Leo the fourth with their adherentes called *Iconomachi*, and *Iconoclaſtæ*, were condemned as heretikes for denying honour to Images, and for breaking and defacing them; and how can our Goſpellers ſhew their faces amongſt Chriſtians, who excede thoſe Image-breakers by many degrees?

Vinc. Lirin. Aug her. 65. Simon Magus hereſie. The agreement of the nevv and old heretikes. Bol. l. 2. to. 3. c. 3. Manicheus hereſie. Li. de fide & operibus c. 14. 2. Pet. 3. Iren l. 1 c. 20. Aug her. 54. The old Soliſidians. Iut. in c. 2. Gal. Calu. in Antid. ſect. 6. can. 11.

The old image breakers. *Zonor. vita Leo 3. Paulus Diaconus.* *Old and new Sacramentar.* *Iren. l. 8. c. 24.* *Ignat. ep. ad Smyrn. Tho. Vvald l. 2. de Sacram. c. 1.* *B. Gvvit. l. 1.* *Damasc. l. de heres.* *Ter. l. de bap.* *Vvald to. 2. c. 69.* *Infra.* *Soc. l. 4. c. 24.* *Hier. Prom. l. cont. pel.* *Hiere. l. cont. illos.* *S. Paul. l. 7. Visib. mon p. 371.* *Nothing but Apostolicæ cã excuse the reformers from heresie.* *The cõclusion.*

9. Vvith the Simonians, Menandrians, and others in S. Ignatius tyme, yea vvith Berengarians and Vviclephistes, they deny that in the Eucharist, Christs body is really present: with the Messalians and Caians, they deny that the Sacraments giue grace, with Iohn Vvicleph they deny that Baptisme, Confirmation, and Order imimprint caracters in our soules: with the Pelagians they say that Baptisme is not necessary: and that without it children may be saued, by predestination, or the fayth of their parents: with the Nouatians they deny the Sacrament of Penance: with the Gnosticks, Manichies and Encratites, they say Matrimonie is no Sacrament, no more (sayeth Caluin) then tillage of the ground, yea spinning and carding: Vvith the Manichies they deny friewil: with Aerius the Sacrifice: with Heluidius and Iouinian, they make mariage equal with virginitie. They marie Priests, and despise Reliques with the same Vigilantius, & with Rhetorius they prayse al heresies, & renew them al: and shal they for one heresie be accursed heretikes, & these men who haue raked hel to rake them altogether, be esteemed of, as pure, sincere and reformed Christians? Shal seueral heresies make them heretikes and shal not al heresies almost assembled together, be sufficient to make these men heretikes? Truly vnles Apostasie excuse them from heresie (who haue denyed almost al pointes of religion, only Christ remaining to vvhose denyal notwithstanding, as the next booke shal proue, they haue made a great steppe) I can not see why the ancient heretikes, for seueral heresies should be connted heretikes, and these for so many which they haue raked together, go for good Christians: especially seing that any one heresie is sufficient to make an heretike, because euery one seuereth, and separareth from the Church, and her faith and doctrin.

10. Certes if these men be no heretikes, the old heretikes were none, if these be no heretikes, neuer as yet were any. If these haue not the marke of an heretike, Simon Magus, Marcion, Cerdon, Pelagius, Wiclif had none: if these be good Christians, al heretikes were so, or if they were noted with the caracter of an heretike, these are so marked, that they shal neuer be able to hide, or wipe away this marke, vntil they abiure heresie, and imbrace vvholly and intierly the Catholique faith vvhich they haue forsaken.

The first

The fifth Chapter handleth an other marke of an heretike, vvhich is vvant of ſucceſſion.

OVR aduerſaries neither can, nor wil deny, but that our Sauiour Chriſt and his Apoſtles, once planted true religion, and eſtabliſhed a true Church in the world, in which Paſtors and Doctors were appointed, to miniſter Sacraments, to preach the word of God, and to gouerne and rule in the Church. The Actes of the Apoſtles witnes no leſſe, which ſet before our eies the beginning and progreſe of the primatiue Church, the beginning in Hieruſalem, the progres amongſt the Gentils. For when Chriſt dyed the principal fundation and corner ſtone vvas layed, when the Apoſtles were confirmed the building went on, and when they by preaching and miracles augmented the number of the firſt Chriſtianes, then was the building of this Church perfited, and brought to that ſplendour & perfection, that the Scribes and Phariſies emulated, and enuied the glorie therof, and ſought the meanes to ruine this worke of God, but in vaine. For as Gamaliel told them, the work of God no prower can diſſolue. Againſt this Church the diuel rayſed a tempeſt, which began vvith a ſtorme of ſtones, amongſt the Ievves. The Emperours and heretikes haue continued the like to this day. In this Church was called a Councel in Ieruſalem, where S. Peter as the head prononnceth ſentence, and S. Iames ſubſcribeth and promulgateth.

Ephes. 4.

Act. Apoſt

Religion vvas once planted.

Act. 5.

Act. 7. c.

The firſt Coũcel.

2. The firſt Paſtors of this Church were the Apoſtles. S. Iames was Biſhop of Ieruſalem, S. Iohn of Epheſus, S. Marke of Alexandria, S. Peter firſt of Antioch, then of Rome, which were his particular Seates. For he was ſupreme Biſhop alſo of al the Chriſtian world. And in Antioch Euodius ſucceded to S. Peter, and after him Ignatius. In Rome after that he had exerciſed the function of a ſupreme Paſtor, for the ſpace of twentie & fiue yeares (departing notwithſtanding ſome times as buſines or perſecution enforced him) before his death he appointed Clemens for his ſucceſſor: but he refuſing, Linus and Cletus S. Peters coadiutors, ſucceded him, and after them S. Clemens accepted of the charge. The other Apoſtles in other places left their

The Seate of the firſt Paſtors.

Euſ. l. 2. c. 15.

Io. 21.

Ep. ad Anti.

Act. 15.

Gal. 2.

Epiph her. 27

Sandpa. 256.

scholars to succeed them, yea and placed others in other places, where them selues could not reside: as S. Iohn appointed Policarp at Smyrna. To be briefe, Ecclesiastical histories, from the Apostles, deriue a Christian Church, and succession of Pastors vnto these dayes. So that a true Christian Church was once planted and established.

Tert. l præs. c. 38.

A Church once planted. That is now the true Church which is likest the first.

3. Which if it be true, then vndoubtedly, that is now the true Church, they the true Christians, those the true Pastors, that the true faith, which from the first and primatiue Church by a continual succession can be deduced: for the Church is called Apostolical, not only because is was once planted by the Apostles, but also because it is descended from them by succession. And they must be heretikes and bastard Chistians, degenerating from their first institution, who can not shew this succession, and their Church can not be Apostolical, but apostatical.

Why the Church is called Apostol. l. præs. c. 20. They are heretikes that can shew no succession.

4. This argument handleth Tertulian in his booke of Prescriptions, where he sheweth how al particular Churches were first planted by the Apostles, and how other Churches from them receiued faith and religion, and (sayeth he) if now you wil know what religion is the true Christiane religion, you must conferre it with some former Church, from which it is descended: because (sayth he) *omne genus ad suam originem censeatur necesse est:* It is necessary that euery kind be valued and esteemed according vnto his source and origine. If you will iudge of water, marke the fountain, if you will know a mans gentrie, looke how he descendeth from the first of his familie, if you wil informe your selfe of any mans title vnto a lordship, you must consider how the first lord entered into possession, and how he is descended from him. And so if we wil discerne the Christian from the heretike, we must haue an eye vnto the roote and stock, from which he descendeth, for so we shal know whether he be legitimate or baseborne. For if he fetch his pedegree from any other then the Apostles, or those which by succession descended from them, then is he a bastard Christian, and caryeth the marke of an heretike.

How to know the true Church. How to know an heretike. An heretike is a bastard

5. The Romaine and Catholique Church which now is, can deriue her Pastors, Religion, & Gouernement, euen from the Apostles, and those whom they appointed Bishops and succcessors. For if you runne ouer Ecclesiastical histories, you shal find our Church and the practise of our religion to haue florished from the beginning vnto these dayes For they treat almost of nothing else, but of the progresse of our Church, of the persecution wherewith it was assayled, of the

The Romain Church fetcheth her pedegree from the Apostles.

heretikes

heretikes by vvhom it was moleſted, of our Biſhops, Prelates, Martyrs Virgins Doctors, of our General and Prouincial Councelles, and of the miracles vvhich were vvrought in confirmation of our fayth In ſo much that if our matters were not, the hiſtoriographers ſhould haue had no ſubiect to vvorke or write on. Ireneus reckeneth the Popes of Rome from S. Peter vnto Eleutherius, Euſebius vnto Silueſter. Optatus vnto Siricius. S Auſtin vnto Anaſtaſius: others goe farther, and Doctor Sanders our countriman bringeth the ſucceſſion of our Popes, Biſhops, Ceremonies. and Religion vnto Pius Quintus tyme, Genebrad hath doone the like vnto Gregories the thirteenth his tyme, and Cardinal Baronius in nine tomes already ſet forth, hath moſt exactly ſet downe the practiſe of our religion vnto Ludouicus Pius of France, whoſe life and death do argue his religion, and in his o tome he bringeth it on a 1000 yeares, to Silueſter the ſecond, and Otto the Emperour. And if our Church agree with the primatiue Church, if our fayth vary not from the ancient fayth, if our Paſtors be deſcended from the Apoſtles, and their ſcholars as al hiſtories and monuments do beare witneſſe, then muſt our Church nedes be the true Church, becauſe it agreeth with the original, and is conformable to the primatiue Church, vvhich as it vvas nereſt vnto Chriſt and his diſciples, and vvas perſecuted and honoured for the true Church, ſo was it the true Church, vnleſſe we wil ſay that Chriſt and his Apoſtles neuer planted a true Church.

l 2. cont Donatiſtas. ep. 365. Sand l. de Vilymon. Gen. in Chronol. Baron in Annal.

The Romain Church the true Church.

6. This ſucceſſion vvas counted alwayes a marke of the true Church, which in our Creede vve profeſſe, vve beleue the Apoſtolical Church, to wit, that which is by ſucceſſion deriued from the Apoſtles and planted by them, and the want of it was alwayes eſteemed a note to know an heretike by. Wherfore Ireneus ſayth that by ſucceſſion vve confound al heretikes: S. Auſtin ſayth, that it is the thing, vvhich holdeth him in the Catholique Church, becauſe (ſayth he) that Church in vvhich is this ſucceſſion, is the rock againſt vvhich the gates of hel can not preuail. If therfore our new Chriſtianes vvil diſcharge themſelues of this marke of an heretike, vvhich is vvant of ſucceſſion, let them ſhew vs (as Tertulian demanded of the heretikes of his tyme) the catalogue of their Biſhops, and the origen of their Church, that if in the ſame vve find them to be deſcended from the Apoſtles, we may acknowledge them as true Chriſtian, if we find that they are not deſcended from ſo noble a race, we may ſhut them out of the Church for heretikes.

Succeßion a marke of the true Church. Symb. Nic. Supra. Lib. cont. ep. fund c. 4. l. de vtilit. cred. c. 17. pſ. cont. part. Donat. l. præſc. c. 32.

7. But I am ſure they can ſhew no ſucceſſion, becauſe they are the firſt them ſelues, and can as ſoone name their predeceſſors, as they can find out Lutheranes before Luther, and Caluiniſtes before Caluin. I wil not deny but that they can deriue ſome pointes of their doctrin from Simon Magus, and other ancient heretikes: but this ſucceſſion proueth them alſo to be heretikes, as is before demonſtrated, but a ſucceſſion from that Church, vvhich was commonly counted Chriſtian, they can not ſhew: yea they can not ſhew vs a ſucceſſion of their doctrin from any ancient heretikes, but are them ſelues the firſt of their familie, ſucceeding to none, but ſent and ordayned by them ſelues, borne prodigiouſly of them ſelues, Children without fathers, and ſcholars without maſters. For although they borow their hereſies of other heretikes, yet they iumpe vvith no heretikes in al points, but either adde or detract, and ſo ſucceed in al points to none.

Newu heretikes may ſome points do renewu old hereſies.

See the firſt booke & firſt chap.

8. Wherfore though ſometymes they vaunte that they ſucceede the Apoſtles, and the primatiue Church, yet ſome tymes the truth breaketh from them againſt their wils, as it doth from the diuel, when by coniuration he is compelled to tel the truth, and then they confeſſe them ſelues to be the firſt of their familie: but this confeſſion condemneth them. Oecolampadius they cal the firſt biſhop of Baſil, and Caluin the firſt of Geneua, Latimer the firſt Apoſtle of Ingland, and Knoxe of Scotland And Martin Luther the moſt anciẽt of them al is not afrayed to ſay, that he was the firſt man that manifeſted the Goſpel, and the truth vnto the world. *Audemus dicere* (ſayth he) *à nobis primó diuulgatum eſſe Chriſtum: Vve dare ſay that Chriſt vvas firſt by vs made knowven vnto the vvorld.*

But they agree nowu fullye vvith any old heretikes & ſo are ſucceſſors to none.

Oe colampadius called the Apoſtles of Baſil. Caluin Geneua, Latimer of Englãd Knoxe of Scotband.

9. I let paſſe that the hath pigges in his belly, & therfore he ſpeaketh in the plural number, but he hath no braynes in his head, nor bloud in his face to bluſh withal, and therfore he dareth be bold to ſay, that he is the firſt man that promulgated the chriſtian law. Art thou the firſt, thou vaunting compagnion? modeſtie vvould yeeld at leaſt to the Apoſtles. So he wil peraduenture, but at leaſt (ſayth he) I am the firſt after them. O monſtrous and Luciferian pride, and now not Luther but Lucifer. Art thou the firſt after the Apoſtles? Where then vvas the Church al this while? Where were other Paſtors and Doctors of the ſame? Vvhere were the Auſtines, Ambroſes, Gregories, Hieromes? Vvas there none al this vvhile to haue bene imployed, but God muſt needs expect til an Apoſtata fryar leaped out of a Cloiſter, and maryed with a Nonne, notwithſtanding that both had promiſed chaſtitie

In præfat. diſp. Lypſia.

Luther proudly terme him the firſt planter of Religiõ after Chriſt.

Luther an other Lucifer.

chaſtitie before God and man by a ſolemne vow.

10. But they haue a ſhift or two by which they think to auoid this argument of ſucceſſion. The firſt is this: our doctrin (ſay they) is Apoſtolical and vve are the Apoſtles ſucceſſors, becauſe v ve preach conformable to that doctrin vvhich they haue left in the Goſpels and Epiſtles by them written. But this ſhift wil not ſerue, becauſe this is to make bare Scripture Iudge of their doctrin, as al heretikes haue done which notwithſtanding (as is in the firſt booke demonſtrated) is no certain rule to ſquare fayth and religion by. Wherfore they haue yet an other anſwer in ſtore, vvhich is this: They grant that the Apoſtles once planted a true Church, true religion, and eſtabliſhed true Paſtors: but afterward this Church fayled and degenerated from that it was, into the Synagogue of the diuel, which they cal the Papiſtical Church, and poſſeſſed the world for many hundred yeares, til at length Luther the man of God, builded this Church agayne, renewed the religion, and appointed new Paſtors: ſo (ſay they) we ſuccede to that Church vvhich the Apoſtles founded, not by a continual ſucceſſion, but by an interruption of many hundred yeares. But aske them vvhat yeare of our Lord, vnder vvhat Emperour or Pope, vpon vvhat occaſion, this Church fayled, and then they can not giue you a reſolute anſwer.

The reformers firſt anſvver.

The refutatiõ

The ſecond as litle vvorth.

The refutatiõ.

11. Luther in the Aſſembly at wormes publikely auouched, that the Church fel in tyme of the Councel of Cõſtance, in which Vvicleph vvas condemned. The ſame Martin, not alwayes myndful of euery word vvhich he hath ſpoken, in his book intitled againſt Papacie, ſayth, that this Church fayled a thouſand yeares after Chriſt, and his reaſon is, becauſe the Apocalips ſayth, that Satan for a thouſand yeares ſhal be tyed, and ſo for ſix hundred yeares he hath bene looſe. In an other place he ſayth that S. Gregorie vvas the laſt good Pope, and that ſince that tyme the Church and Paſtors are degenerated. Yea the ſame man perceiuing how litle agreement is betwixt his religion and that vvhich vvas practiſed euen in the firſt age, and tyme of the Apoſtles, and how vnlike his miniſters are to thoſe ancient Priſtes and Fathers: he ſayth, that the Apoſtles themſelues erred in their Councel holden at Hieruſalem, or elſe (ſayth he) we ſinne now in eating bloud-pudings which they forbad: not knowing (abſurde companion as he was) or not acknowledging, that the precept vvas but for a time to content the Iewes. As for the Councel of Nice vvhich was ſome 300. yeares after Chriſt, he auoucheth that the Canons and Articles of the ſame

Luthers inconſtancie about the fained falle of the Church.

Tom. 7. l. cont. Papatum. l. de Capt. Babyl.

Act. 15.

Luther condemneth the Coũcel of the Apoſtles.

7. But I am ſure they can ſhew no ſucceſſion, becauſe they are the firſt them ſelues, and can as ſoone name their predeceſſors, as they can find out Lutheranes before Luther, and Caluiniſtes before Caluin. I wil not deny but that they can deriue ſome pointes of their doctrin from Simon Magus, and other ancient heretikes: but this ſucceſſion proueth them alſo to be heretikes, as is before demonſtrated, but a ſucceſſion from that Church, vvhich was commonly counted Chriſtian, they can not ſhew: yea they can not ſhew vs a ſucceſſion of their doctrin from any ancient heretikes, but are them ſelues the firſt of their familie, ſucceeding to none, but ſent and ordayned by them ſelues, borne prodigiouſly of them ſelues, Children without fathers, and ſcholars without maſters. For although they borow their hereſies of other heretikes, yet they iumpe vvith no heretikes in al poinrs, but either adde or detract, and ſo ſucceed in al points to none.

Nevv heretikes may ſome points do renevv old hereſies.

See the firſt booke & firſt chap.

8. Wherfore though ſometymes they vaunte that they ſuccede the Apoſtles, and the primatiue Church, yet ſome tymes the truth breaketh from them againſt their wils, as it doth from the diuel, when by coniuration he is compelled to tel the truth, and then they confeſſe them ſelues to be the firſt of their familie: but this confeſſion condemneth them. Oecolampadius they cal the firſt biſhop of Baſil, and Caluin the firſt of Geneua, Latimer the firſt Apoſtle of Ingland, and Knoxe of Scotland And Martin Luther the moſt anciẽt of them al is not afrayed to ſay, that he was the firſt man that manifeſted the Goſpel, and the truth vnto the world. *Audemus dicere* (ſayth he) *à nobis primó diuulgatum eſſe Chriſtum: Vve dare ſay that Chriſt vvas firſt by vs made knovven vnto the vvorld.*

But they agree novv fullye vvith any old heretikes & ſo are ſucceſſors to none.

Oecolampadius called the Apoſtles of Baſil. Caluin Geneua, Latimer of Englãd Knoxe of Scotband.

9. I let paſſe that the hath pigges in his belly, & therfore he ſpeaketh in the plural number, but he hath no braynes in his head, nor bloud in his face to bluſh withal, and therfore he dareth be bold to ſay, that he is the firſt man that promulgated the chriſtian law. Art thou the firſt, thou vaunting compagnion? modeſtie vvould yeeld at leaſt to the Apoſtles. So he wil peraduenture, but at leaſt (ſayth he) I am the firſt after them. O monſtrous and Luciferian pride, and now not Luther but Lucifer. Art thou the firſt after the Apoſtles? Where then vvas the Church al this while? Where were other Paſtors and Doctors of the ſame? Vvhere were the Auſtines, Ambroſes, Gregories, Hieromes? Vvas there none al this vvhile to haue bene imployed, but God muſt needs expect til an Apoſtata fryar leaped out of a Cloiſter, and maryed with a Nonne, notwithſtanding that both had promiſed

In præfat. diſp. Lypſia.

Luther proudly terme him the firſt planter of Religiõ after Chriſt.

Luther an other Lucifer.

chaſtitie

chastitie before God and man by a solemne vow.

10. But they haue a shift or two by which they think to auoid this argument of succession. The first is this: our doctrin (say they) is Apostolical and vve are the Apostles successors, because v ve preach conformable to that doctrin vvhich they haue left in the Gospels and Epistles by them written. But this shift wil not serue, because this is to make bare Scripture Iudge of their doctrin, as al heretikes haue done which notwithstanding (as is in the first booke demonstrated) is no certain rule to square fayth and religion by. Wherfore they haue yet an other answer in store, vvhich is this: They grant that the Apostles once planted a true Church, true religion, and established true Pastors: but afterward this Church fayled and degenerated from that it was, into the Synagogue of the diuel, which they cal the Papistical Church, and possessed the world for many hundred yeares, til at length Luther the man of God, builded this Church agayne, renewed the religion, and appointed new Pastors: so (say they) we succede to that Church vvhich the Apostles founded, not by a continual succession, but by an interruption of many hundred yeares. But aske them vvhat yeare of our Lord, vnder vvhat Emperour or Pope, vpon vvhat occasion, this Church fayled, and then they can not giue you a resolute answer.

The reformers first answer.

The refutatiõ

The second as litle vvorth.

The refutatiõ.

11. Luther in the Assembly at wormes publikely auouched, that the Church fel in tyme of the Councel of Cõstance, in which Vvicleph vvas condemned. The same Martin, not alwayes myndful of euery word vvhich he hath spoken, in his book intitled against Papacie, sayth, that this Church fayled a thousand yeares after Christ, and his reason is, because the Apocalips sayth, that Satan for a thousand yeares shal be tyed, and so for six hundred yeares he hath bene loose. In an other place he sayth that S. Gregorie vvas the last good Pope, and that since that tyme the Church and Pastors are degenerated. Yea the same man perceiuing how litle agreement is betwixt his religion and that vvhich vvas practised euen in the first age, and tyme of the Apostles, and how vnlike his ministers are to those ancient Pristes and Fathers: he sayth, that the Apostles themselues erred in their Councel holden at Hierusalem, or else (sayth he) we sinne now in eating bloud-pudings which they forbad: not knowing (absurde companion as he was) or not acknowledging, that the precept vvas but for a time to content the Iewes. As for the Councel of Nice vvhich was some 300. yeares after Christ, he auoucheth that the Canons and Articles of the same

Luthers inconstancie about the fained falle of the Church.

Tom. 7. l. cont. Papatum. l. de Capt. Babyl.

Act. 15.

Luther condemneth the Cõcel of the Apostles.

He disalowe the Councel of Nice. Supra.

of the same are but *Straw and Stuble.*: which epitheτons he giueth also vnto S. Iames his Epistle. Caluin sayth that Bonifacius the Pope, was the first that was made suprem head of the Church, by Phocas the Emperour, and so he thinketh that then the Church first degenerated: yet the same man in his preface to the King of France, sayth that the Church fel not til the tyme of the Councel of Basil. Melar ἀθensayth that Pope Zozimus was the first Anti-christ, and that since, there was neuer any true Bishop of Rome. Foxe our Martyr maker one while saith that the church fel vnder Pope Gregorie the seuenth, an other while vnder Innocentius the third, an other while vnder Bonifacius the eight as the Treatisse of thee three conuersions deduceth out of his lying martyrologe.

Also S. Iames Epistle. Caluins inconstancie about the same

This disagreement argueth that the Church neuer fel.

12. But first this disagrement of the tyme of this fal, is a sufficient argument that the Church neuer fel: for if it had fallen (it hauing bene once so famous, so glorious, so conspicuous) the fal therof, with the time, occasion, and other circumstances could not haue bene concealed: and as soone may the sunes fal from heauen be known to the world, as the fal of the Church: which is sometimes called a citie on an hil, sometimes a tabernacle placed in the sunne. Secōdly if the Church fel, then certes it was not *builded vpon a rocke but on the sands: then is it not a piller of truth*: then did Christ *pray that Peters fayth might not fayle*, that his Father would send *his Holy Spirit to remain with the Apostles for euer* (that is in their successors, for with them in this life he could not remain for euer) and was not heard. Then did Christ promise that he would *stay with them for euer*, but performed not what he promised. Then was Christ an vnfaythful Spouse, who betrothed him self to his Church, but seperated him selfe from her many hundred yeares. And then did Daniel vnwisely compare Christes Church vnto a *Kingdom which should neuer be ruined.*

Mat. 3. Psal. 18. Mat. 16. 1. Tim. 3. Another argument that the Church fel not.

14. But as S. Austin wel noteth, it is the propertie of them who are not of the Church to say: the Church is not. *Sed illa Ecclesia* (sayth he in the person of the Donatists) *quæ fuit omnium gentium iam non est, periit. Hoc dicunt qui in illa non sunt. O impudentem vocem, illa non est, quia tu in illa non es? Videne tu ideo non sis, nam illa erit, etiam si tu non sis: But that Church which consisted of al nations now is not, it is perished. So they say who are not in it. O impudent voice, Is not that extant because thou art not in it? Looke lest thou the sore be not, for the Church will be, although thou be not.* Wherfore S. Bernard who was one of this Church, doubted not but that she should perseuer to the end: *Ita est, & tunc, & deinceps, non deficiet genus Christianum, nec*

Luc. 22. Mat. 8 Ser. 2. in Psal. 107. They which are not of the Church say it failed.

Ser. 79. in Cant.

num, nec fides de terra, nec charitas de Ecclesia, venerunt flumina, flauerunt venti & impegerunt in eam & non cecidit, eo quòd fundata erat supra petram, petra autem erat Christus: So it is, both then, & afterward, the Christian race shal not fayle, neither fayth from the world, nor charitie from the Church: fludds haue come vvindes haue blovven and beaten vpon her, but the Church fel not, because it vvas founded vpon a rock, and the rock vvas Christ. See page. 74.

15. The words of Christ must be verified (sayth S. Chrisostome) because heauen and earth shal fayle before Christs words: and what are those words saith he, euen those and no other: *Thou art Peter and vpon this rock vvil I build my Church* This Church sayeth he was impugned, but could not be ouercome, dartes were shotte against it, but could not pearse, engines of warre were vsed to ouerthrow it, but this tower could not be beaten downe: Consider (sayth he) the tyrants, beasts, swords, deaths, dartes, which the diuel prepared against this Church but al in vayne, for the diuel hath emptied his quiuer, and shot al his arrowes, but the Church hath no hurt. The persecutors are now dead rotten, and forgotten, but the Church florisheth. Where is now Claudius, where is Augustus, where are Nero and Tiberius: these are now naked names, for them selues are not extant. And thinkest thou, o diuel (sayth he) that thou canst ouerthrow the Church, that art not able to encounter with a young Agnes, a tender Christian mayd, who hath proued stronger then al thy force, and instruments of torments. And if (sayth he) thou couldest not ouercome the Church, when she was young, and had the Iewes and Gentils, Kinges and Emperours against her: thinkest thou now to giue her the foyle or falle? And truly he that sayth that the Church hath fayled, must consequently say with the Atheists, that it was the worke of men not of God, deuised by men to keepe fooles in awe, for if the Church was established by God, then by Gamaliel his rule, it could not by any force of man, be dissolued.

Hom. 1. de Pœnit. *Mat. 16.* *S. Chrisostoms opinion of the stabilitie of the Church.* *Ser. post exilium.* *Act. 5.*

16. Thirdly it is manifest by al histories, general Councels, bookes, of the ancient Fathers extant, and al ancient monumentes, that their Church is nothing at al like the Church, in the first 600, or 300. yeares: and so neither by a continual, nor by a broken succession can they be sayd to succeed the Apostles, and first Christians, as appeareth by the doctrine of the Fathers, and practise of the Church sett downe by Genebrard, & Baronius, and by the histories of Eusebius and others. And this they them selues some tymes confesse. For Luther auoucheth that concerning friewil, the ancient Fathers were al deceyued. And in an other place, he insulteth ouer the Austines, Ciprianes, & al the Fathers,

l. de seruo arb. *l. cont. Regem Angl.*

thers, whose authoritie King Henry the eight had alleaged, for the Sacrifice of the Masse. Caluin as I haue related in my first booke, & fourth chapter, sayeh al the Fathers erred in the matter of penance & satisfaction: which also the Magdeburgians auouch of the Fathers of the fourth age. Yea Caluin also confesseth, that for a thousand and three hundred yeares, al the anciét Fathers allowed of prayer for the dead: yea he sayth, that al the ancient Fathers except S. Austin, erred a bout frie-wil. Luther goeth higher: he sayth, that the first Councel of the Apost. les erred, as also the Councel of Nice. The same Luther in his shortest Annotations vpon the sixtenth chap. of S. Matthew sayth, that no man must be beleued against Christ, although it were Peter him selfe: where he suppoſeth that an Apostle may erre. Caluin saith that the name) Apostle) requireth of the Apostles, that they babble not aboue their commandement: and so he suppoſeth that Apostles may teach errors. Melanthon saith, that from the beginning the ancient writers of the Church, obscured the doctrin of the iustice of fayth. The Magdeburgians complaine of S. Sohn the Euangelist, for allowing of Penance, and voluntarie pouertie: of S. Thomas for hauing the crowne of a Deacon, and for commanding a fast of seuen dayes, and allowing the signe of the Crosse. of S. Andrew also, for præscribing fast: of S. Matthew for allowing of the vowe of Chastitie, and for instituting a colledge of Nunnes, and saying of Masse. They reiect also. S. Iames and S. Iudas Epistles. And Musculus sayth, that whosoeuer was author of S. Iames his Epistle, although he were the brother of Christ, & a piller amongst the Apostles, yet his doctrine can not be any præiudice to the doctrin of onlie sayth. So that either the Church was neuer planted, neuer pure, not in the Apostles tyme, or else the Church of the Reformers, is not Apostolical, because it hath no likenes with the Fathers, and Pastors of the first age, and so neither to them can they succeed, because al the Fathers of the Church, that can be named, yea the Apostles them selues, in their practise and gouernment, euen from the beginning, are contrarie to them in many pointes, and that by their owne confession. This Argument so presseth them, that they dare not stand to this answer, yet they wil play smal play rather then stand our.

l. 1. c. 4. cent. 4.

l. 3. Inst. c. 5.

l. 2. c. 2. 5. 4.

l. de concilys. Actorum 15.

l. 4. Inst. c 8.

Mel. in 1. Cor 3.

Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 10.

c. 4. Col. 54.

l. de notis Ecclesiæ.

17. Luther therfore in his book of notes of the Church, granteth that the Church neuer quite decayed, but only for the most part, and so (sayth he) it decayed euen in the Apostles tyme, for as Christ (sayth he) from the beginning had his Church, so the diuel had his chappel,

An other answer of the aduersarie.

which

which was bigger then the Church, & so there hath been euer a succession of both, but the chappel as it was euer bigger so was it most famous. And this chappel (sayth he) is the Church of the Papists, which is so famous in Ecclesiastical histories.

18. But this shift is pore and ridiculous. For if the Church of the Papists generated from the beginning as Simon Magus did, why were not we called by particular names as al heretikes are? Why was not our autor named? Why is not the tyme & occasion registred? If our Church was euer the greater then was theirs the chappel, for it is against the nature of a chappel to be greater then the Church. If our Church was the greater and most famous, then was ours that societie, which was commonly called the Christian Church, then was our societie that which condemned heresies and called Councels, which was persecuted by Tyrants (and consequently was not the diuels chappel, for he persecuteth not his owne) and fauoured by Constantin and other Christian Emperours, Kings and Princes: for which Monasteries were erected, Churches builded, in which al the ancient Doctors ministred Sacramentes, preached, teached, ruled and gouerned. And where was then Luthers litle flock? What Historiographer wrote the progres of it? What Emperours persecuted it? Vvhat heretikes rayled against it? Vvhat Churches were builded for it? What ministers ruled it? And what was the maner of gouerment in it? If there were no such societie, and no other counted Christian but ours, then either ours was the true Church or else the Church quite fayled, and so they must returne to their former answer, wich yet wil not serue their turne, as is alreadi proued.

A poore answer.

If the Romaish Church changed vvhy chãged it not the name?

Vvhere vvas Luthers Church before Luther?

19. Wherfore if al other fayle, they haue yet an other shift, and that is this. Vve grant, say they, that the Church neuer decayed, but stil stood immoueable vpon the rock, vpon vvhich Christ founded it: but soone after the Apostles time, or peraduenture before they were al dead, this Church became inuisible, and appeared no more openly, but vvas preserued secretly in obscure cornes, til at the length Luther (whom God and his Church al that vvhile expected) brought it to light againe. And al this vvhile (because Ecclesiastical histories conuince them) they confesse that there was a Church commonly called Christian, in vvhich Popes ruled, and Kings and Princes were baptized, but that (say they) vvas not the Church of Christ, but the conuenticle of Papists, and chappel of the diuel, and thus these euil doers fly the light.

A third answer of the aduersarie, that the Church vvas inuisible til Luthers tyme. Mat. 16.

Io. p. 3.

The answer serueth them for. 2. purposes.

First to auoid al iudgement seats.

20. This shift serueth them for two purposes. For first thus they wil frie them selues from al Iudgement-seats. For if you conuent them before Ecclesiastical Iudges, or the whole Church, they wil say that they are not lawful Iudges, and that it is not the true Church, vvhich sum moneth them to appeare, and therfore they are not bound to stand to their sentence, who haue al authoritie on their owne side. And if you aske them from whom they had authoritie, they wil say, that they had their predecessors to whom they suceed, and their Church whose fayth they preach, and that from them they haue authoritie, if you then bid them shew some historie or ancient monument of their Church, they wil answer, that it was inuisible and so wil say what they list, and by no Church past or present, shal you be able to controle them, for they haue a Gyges ring to go inuisible by. Secondly if the Church was inuisible, you can not vrge them to shew any continual succession of it from the Apostles. For they wil say, that their Church succeeded the Apostles, and is the same vvhich they planted, but after the Apostles tyme, was neuer senne til Luther pulled away the bushel, vvhich couered this light.

Heretikes haue a Gyges ring.

Secondly to auoid the argument of succession.

Hovv their Church vvas inuisible.

Mat. 5.

Psal. 18.

If so conspicuous a Church became inuisible the tyme of that darkenes must needs haue been noted.

21. And truly I wil easily grant that their Church before Luther was inuisible. For that vvhich vvas not, could not be senne: but that the true Church was at any tyme inuisible, is altogegether improbable. For vvhen hapned this darkenes I pray you? The Church was once *a citie vpon an hil*, and *a tabernacle placed in the sunne*, how then could it on a sodain come to be inuisible, and no man in the world to note it? Historiographers write of earth-quakes and darknesses: and al the world noted the darknesse which hapned at Christes death: and was there no mã to note this darkenes vvhich couered the whole face of the earth, and hapned after so conspicuous a light? Aristotle sayth that the same sense iudgeth of the obiect, and priuation: as for example, the eye which beholdeth colours and light, perceiueth also, or at least giueth occasion to the inward sense, called *sensus communis*, to perceiue darkenesse, vvhen the light is gone: vvhy then could not they vvhich had senne the Church florish and shine conspicuously, perceiue also vvhen first she lost her light. And if they perceiued it, how chanceth it, that none euer wrote of so strange an accident. But vvhat should I aske so many questions, where I am sure to find no reasonable answeres? I wil now with one argument make al ths darkues of this erronious doctrin, gene place to the light of the truth, to wit, that the true Church can not be inuisible.

22. For

22. For Christ biddeth vs, vvhen our brother wil not harken vnto our admonitions, to complayn of him to the Church. Suppose then that some heretike should preach false doctrin, and being admonished to correct his error, vvould yet remaine obstinate: there is no other remedie but to complayn of him to the Church. And how shal this complaint be made, if the Church can not be found out, as it can not, if it be inuisible? Suppose again some Christian or infidel should beginne to doubt of his fayth, and would fayne be instructed, no doubt his only remedie is, to repayre vnto the Church for a resolution, where only truth is taught, saluation is found; but if the Church be inuisible or decayed, how shal he haue accesse to this Church, vvhich either is not or at least (as they say) is iuuisible? Truly if the Church either decayed or was inuisible, then was the world without meanes of saluation for many hundred yeares.

Mat. 18.
The true Church can not be inuisible.
The first supposition.
The second.

23. But let me demand of them how their Church vvas inuisible, vvhich consisteth of men, and is gouerned by men, and mainteined by visible gouerment, visible Sacraments and audible preaching? They liued not alwayes in holes, some tymes they came abrode, and comming abrode and carying the name of Christians, they were by Papists alwayes enforced to frequent Masse and Sacramentes, and to professe their religion, else had they bene excommunicated, and deliuered to secular power: whence it must needs folow, that either Luthers & Caluines Church was neuer before them selues beganne to preach, or that their Church dissembled against cõscience for fifteen hundred yeares.

Hovv vvas their Church inuisible?
If their Church vvas inuisible they vvere dissemblers.

24. But what do I fight against shadowes, & that which neuer was or neuer was senne? Let me conclude now that which I intended. The ghospellers can not deny but that the true Church was once planted, and that therfore, that is now the true Church, which can by succession be deriued from it (for to say that the Church fayled, or was inuisible, is but a vayne imagination) & seeing that Catholiques can by al Histories and monuments shew, that their Church is descended from that, which was in the tyme of the Apostles, theirs is the Church, and they are the true Christians; and seing that the reformers can not thus deriue their Church from the Apostles (because before Luthers preaching it was neuer senne heard nor felt) it foloweth that their Church is not Apostolical, but rather apostatical and heretical, and they no true Christians but Heretiks.

The cõclusion.
succession proueth the Rom. Church.
Vvant of succession argueth our aduersaries to be heretikes.

The sixt chapter handleth the sixt marke of an hereuike, vvhich is dissension in doctrin; and proueth that peace is a marke of the true Church, and that the dissensious Gospellers, are heretikes if euer any vvere.

CICERO that famous Orator speaking of peace, geueth it this worthy commandation: *Pacis nomen dulce est, res vero ipsa, cum iocunda tum salutaris: The name of peace is svveet, but the thing it selfe is both pleasant and soueraine.* To which opinion of his al men wil easily subcribe, if they enter into consideration of the nature of peace. For what is more pleasant then that which al things desire? & what more healthful and souueraine, then that which preserueth al things?

Peace is so pleasant that al thinges desire it.

2. So pleasant is peace that euen sensles creatures, seme wholly to desire it. The heauens moue al from the East to the west, caryed with the sway of the first heauen, called *primum mobile*, and yet by their proper motions, at the same tyme they moue also from the west to the East, and some swiftly some slowly, yet vvith such vniformitie and agrement, as though they desired nothing more then peace, and feared nothing more then iarring and disagreeing in their motions. The Elementes, vvhen they are out of their natural place, do moue speedily, and make great hast to get to their home, because there only they find peace and rest, to which their nature inclineth. Brute beasts also of one kind, commonly kepe together, and folow one head, as it were with common consent, because one easilier maketh peaceable agreement then many. Bees folow one King (sayeth S. Cyprian) and obey the humming of one master-bee. In al flocks of shepe, there is one Belwether, and in euery heard one is the ring leader, yea, sayth S. Hierome: Cranes folow on in a long order, vvhich they do for loue of peace: for in folowing diuers heades, they would be more diuided, and lesse vnited. Yea sayth S. Austin, no Tigre is so cruel, vvhich doth not licke and like her youngones: No Kite but loueth her brood and seeketh to conserue her familie in peace: much more doth man, who is indewed with reason, couet and desire peace, seme he otherwise barbarous and deuoid of humanitie.

The Elemẽtes desire peace.

Brute beastes also.

Bees flockes & heards.

Cranes.

l 19 Ciu. c. 12.

Tigres.

The kite also.

3. The

3. The Passionate man who fighteth continually against reason to satisfie his passions, seeketh to geue them their desire vvithout contradiction of reason, and consequently coueteth peace: but this is an inordinate peace. The reasonable and vertuous man, vvho seeketh to subdew his passions, & to make them yeeld to reason without repugnance, seeketh an attonement betwixt passion and reason: and this is an orderly peace. The rebellious and mutinous subiectes, who rise in armes against their lavvful Prince, are desirous to enioy their owne wil and to possesse vvhat they desire without resistance, & consequently intēd a peace: but this is an vniust peace. And although by rebellion they breake common peace, yet that is not becausе they hate peace, but becausе they enioy not that peace vvhich they desire. The iust Prince vvho maketh vvarre against iniust vsurpers, euen then vvhen he biddeth warre, aymeth at peace, and intendeth not warre as vvarre, but as a meane to come to peace: and this is a iust peace. Cacus, that barbarous felow, who liued in caues as beastes do, and fed him selfe of the spoyles of others, vvas desirous to enioy his owne desires without molestation, and so desired peace, but a brutish peace. And as peace is most pleasant and therfore desired of al, so is it most soueraine, and therfore preserueth al.

The passionate may desire peace, but inordinate.
The reasonable man desireth an orderly peace.
Rebelles desire an iniust peace.
Aug. supra.
The iust Prince in vvarre aimeth at peace.
Aug. ibidem
Cacus desired a brutish peace

4. Peace betwixt the humours and elementarie qualities in mans body, is health; peace betwixt the two repugnāt partes in mans soule, reason and sensualitie, is vertue: peace betwixt God and man is Charitie: betwixt man and man, is frendship: peace and consorte in voices or instruments, is musick: peace and agreement in colours is beautie: peace in the heauens motions, and in the Elemental qualities, is the conseruation of al. Peace is the maintenance of Families, the preseruation of Cities, the establisment of Colleges, the strength of Common Welthes, the force of Kingdomes, & the felicitie of al Societies. Peace vpholdeth heauen, & without it hel is confused, becausе *euery Kingdom, diuided in it selfe, shal be made desolate.* Peace and vnitie (sayth the Philosopher) maketh natural causes to passe them selues in force and efficacie, becausе force vnited is stronger then it selfe diuided. You may breake a thousand arrowes one being taken from an other, but in a bundel or sheafe not so. Diuide the greatest riuer which is, and a childe wil passe it, but when the water is vnited, you must haue a shippe or boate to sayle ouer. Lay a coale in one corner of the house, and an other in an other, and you may stand in the middest, and blowe your fingers for colde, but vnite them together, & they wil warme the vvhole

Peace preserueth al things.
Frō peace procedeth health vertue charitie frendship musicke bevvtie.
Conseruation.
Peace the maintenance of al Societes.
Mat. 12.
Marc. 3.
Peace addeth force and strength to al things.
Examples.

whole house. Oxen diuided, can not draw that weight, vvhich they can vnited. The greatest armie that is, if it be diuided, is soone defeated, but vvhen the forces are vnited, it is inuincible.

5. Moreouer as peace preserueth al thinges, and giueth strength and force to al: so contrariv vise dissension is the bane of al. Dissension or distemperature of humours in mans body, is sicknes: disagreement of reason and sensualitie in the soule, is vice: iarring of voices or instruments, is vngrateful discord: in colours it is deformitie, in porportions, misshape. Dissension is the vndoing of Families, the dissolution of Colleges, the vveakning of Cities, the ouerthrovv of Armies, the ruine of Kingdomes, & the bane of al Societies. Vvhat Kingdom vvas more likely to haue stood then that of the Angels? Dissension which Lucifer sowed, had almost quite ruined it. What place better fensed, more fertile, and frutful then Paradise? yet dissension betwixt God & man, yea betwixt man and him selfe (for when man disagreed from God, his flesh beganne to resist his spirit, and al creatures before obedient to him, began to rise in armes against, him) banished thence the happy inhabitants, and with them al fœlicitie. Who more nere then Cain and Abel? dissension was the death of the one, and the reprobation of the other. Vvho more likely to haue liued louingly together then Abraham and Lot, Ioseph and his brethem? dissension seuered and separated them. Vvhat Kingdomes more strong and potent then those of the Medes, Persians, Chaldies, and Romaines? Read histories and you shal see, that dissenfion vvas the chiefest cause of their ruines. If then the Maxime of the philosopher be true, that one contrarie setteth forth an other, by the destroying nature of dissension, you may easily perceiue how souerain a preseruatiue peace is, & how iust cause, al creaturs haue, so vehemently to desire it.

It had almost ruined the Kingdome of the Angels.

It ruined the happy state of Paradise.

It vvas the death of Abel

It separated Abrahá and Lot, Ioseph & his brethern.

It ruined the Empires of the vvorlde.

6. This Iewel Christ bequeathed to his deare spouse the Church, when soone after his Resurrection, standing in the midst of the Apostles, he sayed to them: *Pax vobis: peace be vvith you.* Of this peace in an other place h[illegible]ention, where he sayth: *Pacem relinquo vobis, pacem meam [illegible]peace vnto you, I geue my peace vnto you.* Vvhere, for a legacie [illegible]th on his Church, not Gold and siluer, nor Kingdomes nor possessions (though he permitteth Kings to bestovv these things also vpon her) but that which is more vvorth then al the Diademes, and Scepters in the vvorld, to wit peace, without which, no societie can endure. This peace the Prophet Esaie long since foresaw and fortold, when he sayed: *That the vvolfe and lamb shal dvvel together,*

Christ bequeathed his peace to his Church.

Io. 20.

Io. 14.

Isa. 2. 11. 65.

and the

and the Lion, Beare, and Calfe, liue peaceably one vvith an other, and that a litle boy shal driue them to the field. For his meaning is, that in the Church shal be such agreement, at least in matters of Religion; that they who before their conuersion were persecuting Vvolues and Beares, shal liue peacebly with the harmeles lambes and Christians, and that a litle boy, Christ Iesus, the autor of al this peace, shal driue them to field, that is, shal rule & gouerne them. The same Prophet by an other Metaphore *Ibidem.* desctibing the same peace saith: *In those dayes the infant from his mothers pappes, shal delighet and disport him self, ouer the Aspes hole, vvithout receiuing harme:* That is, such peace shal be in the Church, that the children of Christes Church, shal liue quietly with those, who before they receiued Christian fayth, by heresies, infidelitie, or poysoning maners, like serpents infected others. For as in the Arke of Noe, those beasts *Gen. 7.* which were by nature sauage, so long as they were in the Arke, forgot al cruelrie, and liued with the rest most quietly: so how soeuer *A similitude* men before their incorporation and admission into the Church of Christ, were Barbarous in maners, and mutinous in opinions, yet when they are once made mẽbers of the peaceble Kingdom of Christs Church, they lay aside al sectes and factions, and liue quietly together, at least in matters of fayth aud religion. Vvherby it plainly appeareth, that in the Church of Christ is peace and vnitie in religion. Which the Apostle also insinuateth saying: *Being careful to kepe vnitie of fayth, in the band of peace, as you are called in one hope of your vocation, one bodie and one spirit, one fayth, one Baptisme, one God and Father of al.* For as there is one God, one Heauen, one Baptisme: so is there but one faith, and that they are the true Christianes, which conspire in the same. *Ephes. 4.* *One faith only.*

7. And the reason herof is, because the truth is one, neuer disagreeing from it selfe: lyes are many, mutable and contrarie: and therfore sring that the Church is the *piller of truth*, it must needs folovv that vvhere the Church is, there is vnitie, because the truth in which the members of the Church agree, is but one. I wil not deny, but that the Church consisteth of diuers nations, but yet they are so linked in one faith, that in Christ Iesu there is no distinction, betwixt the Barbarous and Grecian, not betwen Iew and Gentile: and although these diuers nations speake diuers languages, yet as Ireneus noteth, these diuers tongues professe one fayth. I grant also that in the Church there are diuers functions & dignities: for there are Popes, Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and so forth: and from them the state of the laitie is distinct, and subiect to them: but these diuers or- *The reason is because truth is one.* *1. Tim. 3.* *Diuers natures in the Church, but one fayth.* *Rom. 10.* *Diuers languages but one professiõ.* *l. 1. cont. her. c. 3.*

Diuers functions but one Hierarchie.

ders make one Hierarchie. I confesse like wise, that in the Church there are diuers states and orders of religious, as of Augustins, Benedictins, Benardins, Dominicanes, Franciscanes, Iesuirs, yet these diuers members make one body, al linked vnder one head Christ Iesus, by one fayth and religion.

Diuers orders & mẽbers yet one Church, one body.

The vnitie of the Church militant stränger then that of the Triumphant.

8. This vnitie, peace, and agreement in one fayth and religion, vvhich is to be senne in the Church militant in earth, seemeth more admirable then that of the Church triumphant in heauen. And the reason is, because the inhabitans of that happy Kingdome, behold God face to face, and see most euidently that vvhich vve beleeue only, and see not at al; and so their agreement in vnderstanding is not so strange, because the euidence of the verities vvhich they see, inclineth them to one assent. For as the Philosopher sayth, the vnderstanding of it selfe is prone to giue assent to veritie and truth, vvhen it is euidently proposed (vvhich is the cause why in things which are euident al men are of the same opinion) and therfore to this proposition: *The vvhole is greater then the halfe*, al men agree, but about the creation of the world, the immortalitie of the soule, the felicitie of man, the substance of the heauens, and such like things, which are not so euident, there haue bene great disputes and contentions, whence hath risen that diuersitie also of the sectes of Platonists, Peripatetickes, Stoicks, Epicureans, and such like. Vvherfore seing that the happy inhabitants of heauen, do see euidently the Diuine nature, and al the Mysteries which we only beleue, I meruayle not that they al agree in one opinion, because the euidence of these things moueth them to one assent. But that so many Christians, of so diuerse countries, and times, so diuersly affected, and disposed, should agree in one fayth and opinion, and thinke, and beleue the same of al the Mysteries of Christian Religion, which they see not, this seemeth most admirable, and so strange that I must needs say: *digitus Dei hic, The finger of God is in this matter*, and he it is, that is the cause of this peace, vnitie, and agreement. For seing that the euidence of our Mysteries causeth not this agreement, and and that it can not be the diuel who thus linketh their vnderstandings (because this Religion in al points is repugnant to him, and his designements) it must needs be God, who inspiring into these diuerse nations and natures one light of fayth, maketh them al to conspire in one belief and opinion. And therfore sayth Tertullian: *Nullus inter multos euentus vnus est exitus, errare non possunt qui ita in vnum conspirant: There is not one end amongest many chances, they can not erre vvho thus*

In euident thinges al men agree.

In hard thinges they disagree.

That Christiäs so agree must needes be of God.

Exod. 8.

Stoius q. 2. prologo.

The reason.

1 prasc. c. 18.

agree

agree in one. Thus vve proue the translation of the Septuagint to be of God, because those diuers writers, being placed in diuers Celles, and forbidden to conferre, could neuer haue so agreed in the translation of the Bible out of Hebrew into Greeke, as if al their translations had bene copied out of one, had not God directed their vnderstandings, and inspired them alike.

Iustinus orat. paran adgent
The proofe of the Translatiō of the Septuagint.

9. Sith then amongst the Catholiques only, this vnitie is to be found, they only are the true Church, to which Christ hath bequeathed this peace and vnitie, and they only are conformable to the primatiue Church planted by Christ and his Apostles, for then the Christian world was of one hart and mynd. And for as much as amongst the new Christians of this age, there is nothing but wrangling and dissension & that in principal matters of religion, their Church is the Synagogue of Satan, and they no members of Christs Church, but heretikes, apostates, & members cut of: ser by this marke of dissension the ancient heretikes were euer knowen and discried to be heretikes.

Vnitie in faith only amongst Catholiques. Vvho therfore are the true Church.
Act. 4.
Vvrangling amongst heretikes. Vvho therfore are the Synagogue of the diuel.

10. Simon Magus the first famous Arch-heretike beganne a sect, but it remained not one for any time, but by and by degenerated into many, and from the Simonians proceded the Menandrians, Saturnians, Basilidians, Carpocratians, and from them were descended the Gnosticks. From Cerinthus sprong the vnhappy branches of the Ebionits, Marcionits, Cerdonists and such like. The Arians were no sooner hached, but they were by & by diuided into Ætians, Eudoxians, Eunomians and diuers others. So variable they were, that Socrates reporteth that they changed their Crede and forme of belief no lesse then nine tymes. The Donatistes likewise were by and by parted into Rogatists, Maximinianists, and Circumcellions. The Nestorians were seuered into Trithettes, Theopaschites, Agnoetians, Seuerites, and such like: The Eutychians into Montophysites, Iacobites, Acephalites, and Theodosians. Vvherfore the ancient Fathers haue obserued that dissension is a marke inseparably fastened vnto heretikes. I lie (sayth Tertulian) if they vary not from their ovvne rules, vvhilest euery one at his pleasure altereth and modifeth (he sayth tuneth) those things vvhich he hath receiued, euen as the first autor framed them at his owne arbitrement, the increase declareth the nature of the beginning and origin? The same is lawful for Valentinus, and for the Marcionits, which was lawful for Marcion: to wit, to deuise new sects and opinions as their sect masters did before them. As Donate (sayth S. Austin) endeuored to diuide Christ that is the Church of

Simon Magus and his Sectes. Cerinthus & his Sectes. Arius and his Sectes. l. 2. c. 32. The Sectes of the Donatistes and others.
l. præscr. c. 42. Dissension a marke of an heretike.
l. de agone Christi. c. 4.

Christ, so him, his owne Scholars by dayly hacking and mangling di-
uided in many peeces.

11. Now that the new Christians of this our last age are in like ma-
ner diuided, and consequently of the same paste and kind, it is toto
Luthers forsa-ken of his Schollars. manifest. Luther was the first man who in this last age beat his witte
to deuise new faythes & religions, and for a tyme he was folowed by
many, but in tyme also, his folowers fel from him, who perceiuing
that they had as good authoritie to preach new doctrin as he had (for
they could say also that Christ sent them, and they could alleage Scrip-
ture for their opinions, if they might interpret it by their priuat spirit
(as why may they not as wel as he?) they thought it more honourable
to be folowed, then to folow, and to be Masters then scholars, and so
leauing Luther in the lurch, they deuised also new doctrines different
from his, & became sect masters as wel as he. Zuinglius therfore being
wearie of Luthers seruice, whom he had courted to long, & perceiuing
Luther would haue denyed the real presence (therby to haue preiu-
diced the Pope) but that the words of Christ (as he confessed) seemed
Mat. 26. to plaine, deuised a glosse for those words: *This is my body*, and said that
As Carolstadius and others. Christ called the bread his body, not because it cõteineth his body real-
ly as Luther affirmed, but because it is a figure of his body. And as Zuin-
glius delt with Luther, so did others. For now the Lutheranes are diui-
ded into seuere & moderate Lutherans, & some glorie in Illyricus Fla-
cus, some adore Melanchon, so that now Luther is left of al his Scho-
lars, and not any one remaineth who agreeth with him in al points.
And as Zuinglius delt with Luther so did others with him, for from
chap. 5. him are descended the Osiandrians, Semiosiandrianes, and Antiosian-
Dissention of al the Gospel-lers. drians. Yea out of Zuinglius sprong that vnhappy branch Caluin, who
addeth to Zuinglius opinion, that although the Sacrament be but a
figure of Christ, yet with it we receiue Christ verily and really, but by
fayth: which doctrin how it can stand with it self, we shal hereafter
discourse. And now these mens Scholars, are diuided into Luthera-
l. in Zingl. nes and dable Lutheranes, Zuinglianes, Oecolampadianes, Calui-
nists, Anabaptists, demi-Lutheranes, Trinitarians, Suenkfeldians,
Protestants, Puritanes, Brownists, Martinists, brethren of the familie
of loue, and of the damned crew, and I know not how many. And it
Luthers Inue-ctiue, and ma-lediction of his children. is a world to see, with what animositie these brethrē write one against
an other. Luther writeth seuerly against the Zuinglians, and Sacra-
mentaries: and a litle before his death in steed of a benediction, which
this father should haue bestowed vpon these his children, he curseth

them

them to hel: refusing al writing & communication with them, saying that in vayne they beleue the Trinitie, and Incarnation, vnles they beleue also the real presence. To whom the Tugurine Zuinglians, answered that Luther sought his owne honour, not the honour of Christ, that he was obstinate and insolent, and one who vseth to deliuer men vp to Satan, that wil not agree to his opinion. And yet our Sacramentaries in England say, that Luther vvas a man of God, and Caluin, sayth that he taketh Luther for an Apostle, by whose labour especially the truth was restored.

Sur an. 1545.

Apol. Eccl. Anglic.

Luther no man of God.

12. It were a tedious thing to recount their dissentions, and it is a pitiful thing to behold in steed of one sayth (in vvhich al the world before Luthers preaching conspired) so many saythes and religions. Of such dissension Hilarius complained in these words: *It is dangerous and miserable that novv there are as many saythes as vvilles, and as many doctrines as maners, and as many causes of blasphemies as vices, and that vvheras according as ther is one God, one Lord, and one Baptism, so one sayth also should be, vve fal from one faith, and vvhilest many saythes are fayned, no sayth remaineth.* And as he thus complayneth of the Arians dissensions, so may we of the dissensions of this age, of which also the very autours of these garboils them selues complaine most lamentably. Luther him selfe sayth, that there is such dissension in the interpretation of Scriptures, that if the world continevv we must haue recourse again vnto the trial of Councels, else we shal neuer agree. Cithreus conplaineth that the Euangelical Doctors (he meaneth ministers) are at greater daggers drawing, then any quarelling souldiars. Heshusius confesseth that whither soeuer he turneth his eyes, nothing almost occurreth but dissensions, new increase of errors, and falling of great Doctors from the veritie. So that euen by their owne confessions there is nothing but wrangling and dissension in religion amongst them. And consequently their Church is not the Church of Christ, in which peace and vnitie florisheth: vvhich hath vpholden and shal stil vphold Christes Kingdom against the tyranies of persecutors, and might and slight of the diuel, and al his members: wheras the kingdom of heretikes must nedes fal of it selfe by ciuil discord and dissension.

l. cont. Const.

The Gospellers complain of their ovvn. Dissension l. cont. Zuing. Luther by force recurreth to Councels. Depraua. conf. Aug. Ep. de Exorcismo.

13. Wherfore Epiphanius compareth them to the vipers of diuers Kindes, vvhich the Ægyptians vsed to conclude in one place together, without either meate with in or meanes to get out: for as they, vvhen they were almost famished, began with teeth to teare and deuour one an other, til al the rest being consumed, the last hauing nothing left to

In Panario. Heretikes like vipers.

A similitude

exercise his teeth on, dyeth for hunger: so heretikes ruine one an other, and one sect deuoureth an other, til at length, the last dyeth of it self by her owne impietie. Others compare them to the Cadmeam brethren vvhich were no sooner borne, but they killed one an other: Others say that they are like Sampsons foxes, which are diuided in the heads, that is in faythes, but yet are linked in the tayles, conspiring al in this intention, to ruine the true Church, but in the meane tyme they ruine their owne, and beating them selues against the rocke of of Christes Church, they do but breake them selues as waues do. Tertullian compareth them vnto waspes, which as Varro witnesseth, are like vnto bees, and singe like bees, but gather neither hony nor vvaxe, and can only sting, and therfore are cast out of the hiue: but being cast out they make their combes by them selues. For so heretikes are baptised like true Christians, cary the name also of Christians, and sing also like them, euer hauing Christ in their mouthes, the Lord, and the Word, but they haue neither the hony of sweet doctrin, nor the waxe of good workes. only they can sting vvith their heresies and blasphemies, the right bees and Christians, and therfore by the chief Pastor, as it vvere the Master bee, they are cast out from the good bees companie, by the censure of excommunication, and being cast out they make their combes, that is sects apart, which they also fil not with waxe or hony, but vvith the poison of heresie.

Heretikes like to the Cadmees.

To Sampsons Foxes.

Li. 4. contra Marcionem. Var. l. 1. de regist. c. 10. Epip. har. 44.

To VVaspes.

A fit similitude.

14. If therfore some one in England (as there are many such) should doubt of his religion I vvould fayne knovv, to vvhich of al the Churches, Sinagogues and sectes, he should repaire for a resolution? If he demand and where Christ is, where true exposition of Scripture is, where true fayth is to be found? the Protestants vvil say, that it is to be found amongst them, the Puritanes wil assure him that Christ is with them: no, wil the Brownists say, he is with vs. And so the poore man shalbe perplex and doubtful to which partie he shal adioine him selfe: for whilest none af al these Sectes and Sect-Masters can proue their mission, and euery one of them vvil alleage Scripture, and their priuate spirit, and none can say more for his Sect then an other, he shal be in doubt vvhich to folow, because one hath no more reason to induce him then an other, and yet he can not folowe them al because their doctrines and faythes are contratie. Wherfore he shal do vvel to giue care to none of them, but rather his best wil be to folow the Counsail of Hilarius: that is to imitate the mariners, vvho after they haue left the hauen and are lanced into the maine Ocean, if they find

If one doubte of his faith, he shal find no satisfaction amongst heretikes.

I cont. Const. Hilarius counsel in such a case.

stormes

ſtormes and tempeſtes, returne again to the hauen, as the only place of ſecuritie. For ſo he hauing left the Catholique Church, and out of it finding nothing but ſtormes, tempeſtes, and contrarie vvindes of opinions, ſhould returne again to the ſame Church, as the only peaceble and quiet hauen, vvhere is no diſſenſion in fayth, but al peace and agreement.

15. But they wil ſay that amongſt vs alſo are great diſſenſions, and diuers ſects alſo of Thomiſts, Scotiſts, Nominals, Reals, and ſuch like. To which I anſvvere, that this diuerſitie of opinions, is not in matters of fayth, but only in certain ſubtilities of Philoſophie, or of Schoole Diuinitie, or other indifferent points of doctrin, not defined by the Church, but left to the frie cenſure of euery man. But yet theſe men as herin they ſhew them ſelues men, who commonly neuer agree where any difficultie is, ſo they ſhew them ſelues Chriſtians, who, if the Pope or Church define any opinion, are then al ready to yeld and agree: and then you ſhal ſee how in Chriſt Ieſus, and his faith there is neither Scotiſt, nor Thomiſt, but al good Chriſtians. Vvhich is the cauſe of the great vnitie in the Church, which muſt nedes be vvanting in the heretikes Synagogues, who hauing left the Church, and refuſing to ſtand to her cenſure, haue nothing to make them agree. For neither is bare Scripture, nor the priuat ſpirit ſufficient, neither haue they any viſible Iudge as is proued, and ſo whileſt amongſt them euery man may beleue as he liſt, they muſt needs haue almoſt as many opinions as heads.

Diuerſitie of opinions amõgſt Catholiques it not in matters of faith.

VVhen the Pope or Church defineth then Catholiques agree.

Heretikes haue nothing to hold them in peace and vnitie.

16. Vvherfore to conclude, ſeing that in the Catholique and Romain Church, is ſuch peace and agreement, that al nations which are members of the ſame, profeſſe the ſame fayth and agree al in one religion, that muſt nedes be the Church to vvhich Chriſt bequeathed his peace, and for as much as among the Goſpellers there is nothing but daggers drovving and vvrangling in religion, that can not be the Church of Chriſt, who is the author of peace and concord, but rather it is an hereſical Synagogue, and they if euer there were any, muſt needs be heretikes, who were euer noted for vvranglers in religion.

The cõcluſion.

The ſeuenth

The seuenth chapter conteineth the seuenth marke of an heretike, vvhich is to be of a particular Sect.

Dionis. l. de diuinis nom. c. 4.

The nature of good.

THE nature of good is, not to conteine it selfe with in it selfe, but rather to impert it self, and to make it selfe common vnto others. That goodly Planet and celestial body, the Sunne, which is the light, and eye of the world, and moderator of tymes and seasons, is not content to abound in him self with light, but bestoweth the same bountifully on al partes of the world: & where he can not be liberal in light, he is bountiful in his influences, which reach euen to the bowels of the earth, and bottom of the Sea. Fire vvil neuer be warme alone, but heateth also the standers by: the fountaine wil not only it self be ful, but runneth ouer, to water the fieldes medowes and gardens. The sweete balme or odoriferous ointment, conteineth not it self with in it selfe, no not within the boxe, but perfumeth al about. To be briefe, there is no good, which is not good to others.

Euery thing seeketh to communicate it selfe.

The Sunne.

The fountaine.

The balme.

2. And herin the riuers imitate their Fountaine, the effectes their cause, & the creatures rather resemble their Creator, then attain vnto his perfection. For he as he is the Fountain of al goodnes, and goodnes it self: so doth he most bountifully impert this his goodnes to others. In the creation of the world, what did he but impert him self by participation vnto al his creatures more or lesse, according to their capacitie? But aboue al, in the Incarnation he hath shewed him self most bountiful, by vvhich he hath communicated him selfe to our nature, not by participation, as he did in creation, but by hypostatical vnion, in substance and person. And because in man, as in a little world al things are contained (for man hath being with inanimate creatures, life with plantes, feeling with beasts, and reason with angels) he hath in man, in some sorte, imperted him selfe to al creaturs. But especially to the humain nature of Christ he hath declared his bountie, to which he hath in such an admirable sorte vnited his Diuine Person, that the same man Christ Iesus s God and man, omnipotent, immense, infinite, and enriched with al the diuine attri-

God most bountifully imparteth him selfe.

First by Creation.

Secondly and especially by Incarnation.

Man an abridgement

Hovv God imperted him self to the humain nature of Christ.

buts,

buts, *per communicationem idiomatum*. Wherfore since the tyme of Christes Incarnation in which he so bountifully bestowed him self, God would no more be so sparing of his graces, as to conclude faith and saluation within the confines of Iudea, but he would haue al saued, would be knowne to al by faith, and honoured of al by religion. And therfore now he hath called Iew and Gentile, the Grecian and the Barbarous, and al nations vnder the sunne vnto his Fayth, Church, and Religion.

Since the Incarnatiõ God is more liberal Isal. 75. He would haue al saued and al to be of his Church.

3. Wherfore this Church almost from the beginning, euen when it was confined within Hierusalem, conteined Parthians, Medes, Persians, Mesopotamians, and as the Scripture sayth, almost al nations vnder the sunne. And when the Holy Spirit descended vpon the Apostles and Disciples in firie tongues, and gaue them the guifte also to speake al languages, that was to signifie that the Church of Christ was not to speake English only, or Scotish and Flemish only, but al languages. Wherfore God promised our Sauiour Christ that he would giue him not England only, not Scotland, Flanders, and Germany only, but *al nations for his inheritance*. And he auoucheth that his Church shal *rule from sea to sea*: and that *al nations shal haue accesse vnto it*. And so accordingly Christ gaue authoritie to his Apostles to preach vnto al nations. Vvherby I gather that the Church of Christ is not to be a particular Sect confined with in any straites & corners of the world, but rather an ample Kingdome, reaching ouer al the world.

Act. 2. The Church of Christ vvas Catholique from the beginning. Ibidem. Proofes that the Church, is Catholique. Psal. 2. Psal. 79. Psal. 81. Mat. 28. Marc. 16.

4. And this we professe in our Crede, when we say that we *beleue the holy Catholique* Church. For *Catholique* is as much to say as *Catholen* vniuersal: *Vvhich name* (sayth S. Austin) *holdeth me in the Church*. And why? because he knew it to be a signe of the true Christian Church, which neuer yet agreed to any hereticall sect, either of the Manichies (of which once he was) or of the Donatistes, or Pelagians, or any other. And this, sayth S. Austin, is so manifest a marke of the true Church, that heretikes them selues, ambiciously affect the same: but yet if you aske for the Catholique Church, they point to ours, knowing in their conscience that ours only is in deed Catholique. And so S. Austin and Optatus refuted the Church of the Donatists by this argument especially, because it was confined with in the limites of Africa. And Pacianus sayth that so soone as certain singular Sect-masters deuised new religions, and were called by particular names, the true Christians, to distinguish them selues from particular sectes, tooke the name Catholique euen from the beginning (as appeareth

And not a particular sect Symb. Apost. & Niceph. Aug. ep. 170 l. cont. ep. fundamenti c. 4. The name Catholique vvhy it holds. Aug. Ibidem. & li. de vera rel. c. 7. l. de vtil. credendi. c. 7.

by the Crede which the Apostles made) which name foundeth neither of Marcion, nor Apelles, nor Montanus as he sayth, nor of Luther, nor Caluin may you say. And Tertullian so long as he remained Catholique him self, confessed that the true Church was that which was diffused through out al the world. Yea he sayth, that in his tyme the true Christians notwithstanding the violence of persecution *filled the Pagines cities, Ilands, Castles, Courts, Senats, and only lefte their temples to them selues*: but no soner was this man become an heretike, but he affirmed most absurdly, that the Church might consist of three persons, though they were of the laitie. Vvhich he did partly because he would make vp a Church of Montanus Prisca and Maximilla, to whom he had vnited him selfe, partly to deliuer him selfe from the name of an heretike, to which he saw he him selfe subiect, because he was now of a particular sect. Pacianus sayth that *Christian* is his name, *Catholique* his surname: by that he is called, by this distinguished from al heretikes. And yet againe he saith, that the Church is a ful body dispersed though al the vvorld, a vine ful of branches which reach from Sea to sea, a house ful al kinde of vessel: and that al heretikes are no bodyes, but parres, no vines but branches cut of, no whole thing but only parcels peeces and patches, as S. Austin sayd of the Donatistes. Optatus mileuitanus writing to Parmenianus a Donatist, pronounceth this sentence of him and his felowes: *Intellige te vel serò vos esse filios impios, &c. Vnderstand you though lately, that you are vvicked children, bovves riuen from the tree, branches cut from the vine, and a riuer separated from the fountaine Forthe riuer can not be the source and fountaine, because it is litle, &c.* and a litle before that, he proueth them not to be the Church of Christ, because they were only in Africa. And as the Church filleth al countries, so doth it by succession replenish al ages, as aboue in the fifth chapter is proued. S. Ciril also in the same sense vnderstandeth the name Catholique: *Catholica vocatur, &c.* It is called Catholique, because it is diffused through out the whole world, *&c.* So that it is sufficiently proued that the Church of Christ is *Catholique* that is, a Societie professing one fayth in al countries, yea and ages also, according to that of Vincentius Lirinensis: *In Ecclesia Catholica tenendum quod vbique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum fuit: In the Catholique Church that is to be holden vvhich euery vvhere, alvvayes, and of al hath been beleeued.* For that (sayth he) the name Catholique importeth.

Ibidem.
l. cont. Iudaos c. 12.
Apol. c. 37.
l. de exh. cast.
Supra.
Ep. 3. ad Sympron pſ 79.
Aug in pſ. 65
l 2. cõt. Parm.
Catech. 18.
The Church Catholique.
Vvhat is Catholique. chap. 3.

5. Now let vs see whether the Romain Church and fayth, or rather the Church of the reformers, be the Catholique, and consequently the Christian

Christian Church, for these two *Catholique* and *Christian* euer went together. And here I require no Diuines, nor Philosophers to be iudges in this matter, only let me haue men that haue eares or eyes, and I desire no more. For the eye wil easily iudge, whether of these two Churches is most like to be Catholique. The Romain Church, which the aduersary calleth Papistical, hath florished in al ages & in the most part of the world, as al histories wil testifie. And now at this day our fayth and Church, one and the same, is diffused through out Spaine, France, Italie, Portugal, and a great part of Flanders and Germanie, yea it reacheth euen to the Indianes and other new found countries, conuerted by the Iesuites Franciscanes & other religious men. And so it is Catholique, because being one and the same, it hath euer possessed al ages, and countries, and stil doth euen to this day.

The Romain Church Catholique.

See the first booke & first chap.

6. As for the reformers Church and faith, I see no signe of a Catholique Church in it. For first it began not an hundred yeares since, as before is demonstrated. Secondly it neuer yet possessed the whole world, nor any great part of it, as the eye wil beare witnesse, only it hath gotten entertaynment in certayne partes of the world, as England, Scotland, Holland, and some Cantons of Germanie. Thirdly it is not one Church nor fayth that possesseth al these places, but many, yea scarce one religion filleth one shire or citie. Wherfore although England were al the world, and this age al ages, yet were not their religion Catholique, because it is not one fayth and religion in al the shyres of England, nor al the yeares of this age: for in England are many sectes, and religions, & they also different from the new faythes of other countries: for there is great difference betwixt them, and the Lutheranes in Germanie, Hugonots in France, and Gues in Flanders. Neither is it sufficient for any of them to say, that their fayth is Catholique, because al are inuited to it, and comanded to accept of it, for so euerie sectmaster may say of his religion, and I haue proued that the true Christian fayth, Church, and religion, is Catholique in that it being one, possesseth al ages, and countries.

The heretikes Church is not Catholique. In the firste chapter.

7. Wherfore to conclude, seing that the Church or rather Churches of the reformers neuer possessed al ages and countries, yea neuer one and the same filled any one countrie, it foloweth that their Church is not Catholique and consequently not the true Christian Church, and so they are no true Christians, but heretiques and singular sectmasters, if euer there were any: because in that they are of particular sectes, they weare the same badge which Donatistes, Arians, Nestorians, and

The cõclusion.

such like haue worne before them, and for which they were euer counted, and called heretikes.

The eight Chapter discourseth vpon the eight marke of an heretike: vvhich is to be condemned for an heretike by that Church vvhich vvas commonly counted the true Christian Church.

Similitude.

AS vvhen the subiectes beginne to make rebellion, the Prince suppresseth them or cutteh them of, & whē any shepe of the flocke are infected, the good shepheard separateth them from the rest, lest they infect the vvhole flocke: as the surgeon cutteth of the rotten member lest it corrupt the whole body; & the careful husbandman plucketh vp the vveedes, left they ouergrow the good corne: so the supreme Pastor of the Church, when any rebellious heretikes rose vp against the Church, to whom they ought of right to be subiect; assembled alvvayes his forces together, that is, called Generall Councels of his Bishops, and by the censure of excommunication suppressed these rebelles, lest by their ciuil warres they should molest the peace of Christ his Church, and endeuoured to separate these infected sheepe, lest they should infect the whole folde of Christ, and to cut of these rotten and rotting members, lest they should corrupt the whole body, and to pluck vp these noysome weeds, lest they might paraduenture ouergrovv the good corne.

Thecause vvhy at the first there vvere no General Councels.

2. And although in the beginning, by reason of persecution and want of habilitie, the Church could not haue her General Councels, yet euen then the Pastors of the Church assembled themselues together in writing, by which they refuted al heresies, and made the autors Knovvne, that others might the better auoid them. But after that the Church had gotten a Constantin for her champion, & temporal Princes for her Protectors, then against Arius she gathered a Councel at Nice consisting of three hundred and eightene Bishops: by which number as Abraham once subdewed fiue Kings, so our Sauiour Christ by Pope Siluester his Vicare, at Nice the citie of Victorie (for so much the Greek word importeth) by Victor also and Vincentius, vvhose names

The Councel of Nice against Arius.

Athan ep ad Ion. & disp. con. Arin.

are vi-

are victorious, gotte the victorie of Arius, and the Quartadecimanes and defined against the Arrians, that the Sonne was consubstantial to the Father, and against the Quartadecimanes vvhat day Easter should be kept and obserued. Which being done the excommunication, condemnation, curses, and anathems were thundred out against them: and a Synodical Epistle was written to Pope Siluester, who confirmed the Councels sentence in an other Councel at Rome. The Emperour Constantin reuerencing this sentence as the sentence of Christes Church, banished Arius commanded his bookes to be burned, and him and his to be taken for accursed heretikes; and after a banquet to vvhich he inuited the holy Bishops, he conueighed them home as honorably, a they were called together. So against Macedonius, vvas gathered the second Synode at Constantinople by the authoritie of Pope Damasus, for the defence of the Holy Ghosts Diuinitie. Against Nestorius a general Councel was called at Ephesus by Pope Celestin, vvherin vvas defined that in Christ is but one Person. At Chalcedon by the authoritie of Pope Leo the first in a general Councel, Eutyches was condemned for affirming but one nature in Christ. And the like general consent of the Church in condemnation of the Pelagians, Imagebreakers, Berengarians, Wiclephistes, and such others I could easily alleage out of Ecclesiastical histories, and the Councels themselues. But this may suffice to shew that whensoeuer any preached new doctrin, the Christian world wondered at them, the Church admonished them, and if they refused to obey her, she in General Councels condemned them; and the Emperors & Catholique Princes executed their lawes, vvhich were enacted against heretikes, and then al good Christians shunned them as infected and infecting persons.

Euſ. l. 3. de vita conſt.
Socr. l. 6. 7.
Conſtantines reuerence to this Councel.
The 2. Sind of Conſtantinople againſt Macedonius.
Ex Photino l. de 7. Syn.
The Epheſin councel againſt Neſtorius ex Euāg. l. 1. c. 4.
A councel at Calcedon againſt Euti.
Ex Euang l. 2. c. 4.
Councelsvvere commonly called vvhē nevv heretikes aroſe l. cont. proph. hæreſum nouitatet c. 10.

3. For as Vincentius Lyrinensis sayeth: *Annunciare aliquid Christianis Catholicis præter id quod acceperunt, nusquam licet, nunquam licebit, & anathematizare eos qui annunciant aliquid, præterquam quod semel acceptum est, nunquam non opertuit, nusquam non opertet, nunquam non opertebit: To preach vnto Christians other doctrin then that vvhich they haue already receiued no vvhere is lavvful, and neuer shal be lavvful: and to accurse as heretikes those vvhich preach other doctrin then vvhich before hath been accepted, it vvas euer behoueable, it is euery vvhere behoueable, and euer shal be behoueable.* And whosoeuer readeth the Ecclesiastical histories shal see how alwayes, they were taken for heretikes, vvho were condemned by General Councels, and holden so by that Church vvhich commonly was called Christian. And good reason, for he that wil not obey the Church must be by Christes commande-

They vver euer counted heretikes vvho vvere cōdemned by councels of the church vvhich vvas cōmonly called Christian.

mandement, eſchewed as an Ethnike and Publicane.

The marke of cõdemnation by the Church aggreeth to the Goſpellers

4. Let now the indifferent reader be Iudge whether this note and marke agreeth not as properly to Luther, Caluin, and their followers, as euer it did to Arius, Macedonius, Neſtorius, Eutiches, and ſuch like, vvho by their owne confeſſion were infamous heretikes. They taught ſtrange doctrines neuer alowed by that Church vvhich was commonly counted Chriſtian: ſo did Luther and Caluin. At them, vvhen they began to preach, the Chriſtian world vvondered: ſo did it vvhen theſe men began. Vvhen they by the Churches admonition could not be reclaimed, the Church by a General Councel, in vvhich the Pope ruled by his Legates, condemned them as heretikes: ſo when Luther began to preach, Pope Leo the tenth of that name warned him of it, & ſent Cardinal Caietan a learned & famouſe diuine, to conferre with him, but he being protected by the Duke of Saxonie, though ſome tymes he fayned that he would ſubmit him ſelfe, remained obſtinate: wherfore a general Councel vvas called at Trent, where by the ſentence of the learnedſt, graueſt, and wiſeſt Prelates of the world (for there were preſent ſix Cardinals of which foure were Legates, three Patriarches, 25. Arch-biſhops, 168. Biſhops, ſeuen Abbots, ſeuen Generals of religions, 39. Procurators, and other learned men very many). Luther and all the heretikes and hereſies of this age were condemned, euen as Arius and other heretikes in other Councels before had been. But they ſay that it was not the true Church vvhich condemned them. And might not Arius haue ſayed the ſame? And vvhen I pray you, did the true Church that once vvas, and vvhich condemned Arius, degenerate? Vnder vvhat Pope and Emperour? In vvhat age? in what year of our Lord? vpon vvhat occaſion? But this miſerable refuge of theirs is already reiected. At leaſt that Church, vvhich vvhen Luther began to preach, vvas commonly counted the only and true Chriſtian Church, condemned them, and ſo if euer there vvere any heretikes, theſe men alſo muſt be counted ſo, elſe the ſentence geuen againſt Arius, by that ſocietie which was commonly connted Chriſtian, muſt be reuerſed, or at leaſt again examined.

The Councel of Trent called againſt the nevv Goſpellers

Their vain obiection.

cap. 5. The cõcluſion.

Other markes of heretikes.

5. To theſe markes may be added others, as want of miſſion, allegation of bare Scripture, bragging of the priuate ſpirit, cõtempt of Fathers, wãt of a viſible Iudge, of which, I haue ſpoken in the firſt booke, for theſe were the properties of al heretikes, and are as proper to our new reformers, as euer they vvere to any ancient heretikes, as by the ſame chapters doth appeare moſt euidently.

THE

THE THIRD BOOKE CONTEINETH A SVRVEY OF DOCTRIN CONCERNING CHRIST: IN WHICH BY MANY poinctes is proued, that the they are Anti christians, rather then Christians.

The first Chapter proueth that their doctrin despoileth Christ of his Diuinitie, and that therfore they are no sincere Christians.

EVERY man liketh and loueth which he professeth, & wil speake honourably of him whom he foloweth in that profession. The Stoickes commend Zeno, the Platonistes prayse Plato, the Peripatetickes Aristotle, the Epicureans Epicure, the Atheists Diagoras, and euery one reuereneeth & respecteth him, whose doctrin and profession he embraceth. If then the reformers be sincere and real Christians (as they wil seme to be) they must think, and speake of Christ very honourably, & giue that homage to his Person, which his doctrin hath deserued. And as in wordes they seme to do.

The reformers wil seme to geue much, yea al to Christ.

2. Luther when he first began to preach against Indulgences, merits, satisfaction, good workes, and inherent iustice, affirming that only to beleue that Christs Iustice is ours, is sufficient to saluation, vsed this for a cloke, that forsooth he gaue al to Christs iustice, & nothing to our workes. Caluin also in the preface of his Institutions which he wrote to the French King, commendeth his owne doctrin for this

Lut. in com. Gal fol. 290.

In præf. Inſt. ad Reg Gall.

for this point eſpecially, that it geueth al honour to Chriſt, & leaueth nothing to our owne force and habilitie. *And vvhat doth better agree vvith faith (ſayth he) then to acknovvledge our ſelues diſpoiled of al vertue, that of God vve may be clothed: deuoid of al good, that of him vve may be filled: bond-ſeruants of ſinne, that of him vve may be made free: blind, that of him vve may be enlightened lame, that of him vve may be made ſtraight, feeble, that of him vve may be vpholden: to take from our ſelues al matters of glorying, that he alone may be glorious on high: and in him vve may glorie.* So that vvhileſt they deny good vvorkes to be neceſſarie and affirme fayth only ſufficient, vvhileſt they ſay that we haue no inherēt iuſtice, but are the beſt of vs, though Apoſtles, mortal ſinners before God, that our beſt workes are ſinnes, and that we haue no other Iuſtice then the iuſtice of Chriſt apprehended by fayth, and imputed only to vs: vvhileſt they deny that we can obſerue the commandementes, or haue the power and free wil to do any good, or reſiſt any tentation, they attribute, forſooth al to Chriſt, and leaue nothing to vs, that he only may be glorified. But by this booke I hope to make better knowne their deep diſſimulation, vvho in vvordes ſeme to giue al to Chriſt, and by their doctrin, do robbe him and deſpoile him of al his honourable titles.

Hovv they ſpul at Chriſtes Diuinitie.

3. And firſt you ſhal ſee how ſacrilegiouſly they plucke and pulat Chriſtes Diuinitie. I vvil not here relate the blaſphemies of Michael Seruet who yet vvas a brother of this religion, becauſe they wil ſay, that for ſuch doctrin Caluin cauſed him to be burned, for he ſayed plainly that God the Sonne was not true God, nor coequal with his Father, yea he ſayd that God the Father only was God: which doctrine notwithſtanding he gathered, or might haue gathered out of Luthers and Caluins vvorkes. Neither wil I ſay any thing of the heretikes and new Arians of Tranſiluania, who in this alſo agree with Seruetus. But Luther the grand Patriarch and new Euangeliſt muſt not be omitted: vvho in his booke againſt Latomus ſayth, that he can not abide the word omouſion. *Anima mea* (ſayth he) *odit vocabulum* Homouſion: *My ſoule hateth the vvord conſubſtantial.* So did the Arians hate the ſame word, & called it *exoticum, ſtrange and vnuſual.* But Athanaſius gathereth this word out of Scriptures, and ancient Fathers, vvho in that they affirme that the Sonne is begotten of his Father, & coequal vnto him, and one vvith him, affirme alſo, that he is conſubſtantial, and of the ſame ſubſtance with his Father, becauſe nothing is equal and coequal to God the Father but God, and nothing is God vvhich is not the ſame ſubſtance with him, becauſe there are not many Gods. And vvhy

I cont. Iatom. Luther hateth the vvord homonſion. So did the Arians. Ep. Decr. Conc. Nic.

ſhould

ſhould Luther hate this word but for the ſignification, for the ſound is no more vngrateful then the ſound of other words? If he hate the ſignification, then is he an Arian, vvho beleueth not that the Sonne is conſubſtantial, & of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father, & cõſequently he thinketh him not to be God, or elſe he thinketh that there are many Gods different in ſubſtance. The ſame Luther as diuerſe affirme in an edition of his Commentaries vpon Geneſis (vvhich I haue not of ſeen) calleth the Sonne of God the inſtrument of his Father, by which he created the world, which maner of ſpeach Arius vſed: And ſeing that the inſtrument is neuer of ſo noble a nature, as the principal agent, what is this but to make the Sonne of God, inferior to his Father, and conſequently a creature? And this teſtimonie (as I haue read) Serueetus alleaged againſt Luthers Scholars in the Alban diſputation. Luther alſo blotted out of the Germain prayer books, thoſe ancient words *Sancta Trinitaas vnus Deus, miſerere nobis: Holy Trinitie one God, haue mercy vpon vs.* And vvhy? for ſome ſpite belike vvhich he conceiued againſt Chriſt Ieſus the ſecond Perſon in Trinitie. For vvhy elſe did he in his Germain Bibles when he came to the tranſlation of thoſe words of the ninth chapter of Eſaie, *Deus fortis, ſtrorg God:* leaue out, God? as though Chriſt were ſtrong but not God. Vvhy did he leaue out quite thoſe words of S. Iohns Epiſtle, *Tres ſunt qui teſtimonium dant in cælo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus Sanctus, & hi tres vnum ſunt. There aee three vvhich giue teſtimonie in heauen, the Father, the VVord and Holy Ghoſt, and theſe three are one?*

in 1. ca. Gen.

1. Io. 5°

4. The ſame Luther in his booke of Councels excuſeth Eutyches, and Neſtorius and accuſeth S. Leo and S. Cyril as men vvhich vvere to eagre againſt them, for (ſayth he) as Eutyches ſayed ſo may it wel be ſayed, that Chriſts Diuinitie ſuffred. O blaſphemie! did the Diuinitie of Chriſt ſuffer? then was it not true Diuinitie, and conſequently Chriſt was not God, becauſe God as God can not ſuffer. I may vſe here Alamundarus vvitty anſwere againſt certain heretical Biſhops, that ſayd Chriſts Diuinitie ſuffred on the croſſe: for vvhen he heard that they were come to ſpeake with him, he commanded his man preſently after their entraunce to whiſper him in the eare, vvhich being done Alamundarus ſtarted at the vvhiſpering, and ſemed aſtoniſhed. The Biſhops thinking that his man had told him ſome euil newes, demanded vvhat it vvas at which he was amazed? My man (ſayth he) teleth me that Michael the Archangel is dead. Tuſh, Tuſh, (ſayd they) that newes can not be true, becauſe Angels can not dye. Can not Angels dye

l. de concil. 2. par. Luther ſayth the Diuinitie ſuffred. Nicephl. 16 hiſt. c. 35. Baron in Annal anno Chriſti 509. a vvittie maner of anſvvering.

gels dye (sayd Alamundarus) and thinke you that Gods Diuinitie could suffer?

Melanthons Diuinitie of the Sonne of God. Anno 1556. l. cont. Stanc. ep. ad Elect. Ep. 28 tract. pag 994.

5. Melanchon in his book of common places, and in diuers other places hath these propositions. *The sonne of God according vnto his diuinitie prayd vnto his father for his Kingdom, glorie, and inheritance The diuine nature of the sonne, vvas obedient to his Father in his Passion* The like saying hath Beza, yea and Caluin also. Is not this to deny Christs Diuinitie and coæqualitie with his Father? For who but an inferior prayeth? who but an inferior obeyeth?

Beza & Calvins opinion. Illic. Romn. apud Bel. to. 1. l 3 de Christo in initio. Lutser. de cæna Domini to. 8.

6. The Lutheran Vbiquetaries also, vvho affirme that the diuine attributes are really communicated vnto Christs humain nature, and that in such sorte, that the humain nature was immense and omnipotent as the Diuinitie was, destroy Christes Diuinitie, whilest they extol his humanitie: for by this doctrin it foloweth that Christs Diuinitie was nothing else but his humaine nature deified and really turned into Diuinitie, and seing that humain nature can not in this maner participate of the Diuinitie, it folo veth that Christ is not true God, because he hath not true Diuinitie. For although by incarnation man was God, and so consequentely immense and omnipotent, by a certain communication, vvhich Diuines cal *communicationem idiomatum*, Yet the humanitie could neuer really be the Diuinitie, nor omnipotencie, nor any other diuine atribute.

The opinion of the Vbiquitaries.

Li cont. Valentinũ Gentilem. Caluin sayth, the Father is the principal God. li. 1. Inst. c. 18. 9. 10. 28. 25. Yea that Christ is not God of God. VVhitaker.

7. And to come to Caluin, he sayth plainly that the name of God agreeth to the Father *per excellentiam by excellencie*. Which if it be so, then God the Sonne is not so Excellent a God as the Father, and consequently no God at al. He also in diuerse places auoucheth that Christ is not God of God, as the Nicen Councel calleth him, he denyeth that by eternal generation God the Sonne hath his essence from his Father, yea (sayth he in the same place) the essence of the Sonne is no more generated then the essence of the Father. To whom in this point subscribeth our countriman M. Whitaker in his booke against Father Campian. O blasphemies! and that of them that wil nedes be counted reformed Christians. Better were it to deny Christ flatly, then to professe his name, and yet vnder hand to disgrace him: for dissembled religion is duble iniquitie. Is not Christ God of God the Farher? then is he some other God, hath he not his essence from his Father? Then is he not the Sonne of God, because the Sonne taketh his substance from his Father. Is not the Sonnes essence generated? then is not the Sonne begotten of his Fathers substance, then is he not consubstantial to his Father,

Out of Caluins doctrin is deduced that

ther, but rather of an other nature, and consequently either a creature or an other God. The diuines grant that the essence and Diuinitie absolutely without addition, is not sayed to be generated, for then it should be generated in God the Father also, but yet they affirme that God the Sonne is God of God and begotten of his Father, and that by eternal generation he receiueth without al imperfection his essence from his Father, and consequently that the essence is generated, not absolutely but in the Sonne, else were he not a Sonne nor should be consubstantial to his Father.

Christ is not the Sonne of God.

8. The same Caluin accompanyed with diuers others both Caluinists and Lutherianes, affirmeth that Christ according to his Diuinitie was Priest and mediator. To whom Iewel in his booke against D. Harding subscribeth, where he saith, that in Christ there were two natures, & that the Humanitie was offered in sacrifice, but the Diuinitie played the Priest & offered vp this sacrifice. See here an other blasphemie. Is Christ Priest according to his Diuinitie? Did his diuine nature offer vnto the Father the sacrifice of the humain nature? then certes Christ was not only as man but also in respect of his Diuinitie, inferior to his Father (for the Priest is inferior to God to whom he offereth sacrifice, because in oblation of a sacrifice he acknowledgeth God the supreme excellēcie) & so was either a creature or a lesser God, and so no God at al. The ancient Fathers and diuines do grant that the same Iesus Christ was Mediator betwixt God and man, and God also, to whom Mediation was made, by reason of his two natures subsisting in one Person. For a Mediator like a meane, must participate of both extremes, & therfore sith man had offēded, & God was offended, the Mediator must be God & man. For God only could not satisfie, because he could not suffer, man only could not satisfie, because his satisfaction would haue bene lesse then was the iniurie: vvherfore it vvas necessarie, that one vvho vvas both God and man, should make this meditation and satisfaction. And so the same Iesus Christ, God and man satisfied, yet not as God but as man, & he as the Person offended, receiued also the satisfaction, not as man, but as God. In like maner the same Christ Iesus was the Priest, the Sacrifice, and the God to whom this sacrifice was offered. And so Christ was the Priest yet not as God but as man, for in this only respect Christ had a superior to whom he might offer a sacrifice: Christ also was the sacrifice, but as man, for his humaine nature only suffered. And Christ also was he to vvhom the sacrifice was offered. but as God, for so he was no lesse offen-

Ep. duabus ad Polon. Pet. Mar. duab ep. Kemn. de duabus nat. Mel. loc. c. de filio. Iewellus pa. 37

If Christ as Caluin and Others say vvas priest according to his Diuinitie thē vvas he not God.

The Fathers maner of speach.

How Christ vvas Priest. Sacrifice and God to vvhom Sacrifice vvas offered.

offended, and iniuried by mans sinne, then God the Father. I referre the reader to a booke which one *Ægidius Hunnius* a Lutheran writ against Caluin, in which he declareth how Caluin stil expoundeth the old and new Testament in fauoure of the Iewes, as though the places spake not of Christ, and therfore this man calleth his booke, *Caluinus IudaiZans, Caluin playing the Iewe.*

Caluinus IudaiZans.

9. Tel me now gentle reader, whether these men (as they say) do attribute al vnto Christ, who as thou hast heard, do despoile him of his greatest titles of honour, that is true God, and Sonne of God? But thou wilt say, that in many places Caluin and others grant that Christ is true God, and the Sonne of God. I wil grant it also, for Caluin in the first booke of his Institutions and thirtenth chapter, indeuoreth to proue Christes Diuinitie, but yet thou seest also how they eate their words, and deny in one place which in an other they affirmed. And so to conclude either they speake thus wittingly of Christ, and so they are no Christians but renouncers of Christ, or of ignorance, & so they are not men to be followed in so great matters as fayth is, who haue neede them selues to lerne their catechisme, which teacheth how to speake, and beleue of Christ and God.

l. 1. Inst. c. 11.

The Conclusion.

The second chapter shewveth, howv by their doctrin they make Christ an absurd Redeemer.

Mannes felicitie in paradise.

MAN once was frie of condition as being created Lord ouer al, and subiect to none but God, vvhose seruice is no seruilitie: he vvas noble of birth as being framed by God his owne hãds of virgin earth, which yet was not stained by sinne: he was happie in state, as being indewed with a body immortal, fried from diseases, death, and distemperature, neither benummed with cold, nor parched with heat, nor pined with hunger, nor molested with thirst: enriched with a soule filled with grace and spiritual treasures, which was prone to vertue, not inclined to vice, neither molested with concupiscence, nor overruled by passion, but ruled by reason, which was ruled by grace. His superior part vvas obedient to God, his inferior part to the superior, sensualitie to reason, the flesh to the

to the ſpirit, and al creatures to him were buxome and obedient. Beſides this inward fœlicitie of ſoule and body, he was placed in Paradiſe, where he was enuironed and compaſſed about with al delightes, and pleaſures, and farre from al diſpleaſures.

2. But vvhen by ſinne man vvould not be ſubiect to God, he became a ſlaue to his owne fleſh, paſſions, and ſenſualitie, a bondman to ſinne, captiue to the diuel, ſubiect to death and mortalitie, hel, and damnation. And of al this ſeruile ſubiection, ſinne vvas the cauſe. For vvhen Adam ſinned, and vve in Adam tranſgreſſed, vve vvere by and by guiltie of death, vvhich is *the revvard of ſinne*, and by ſinne vve became ſlaues to ſinne, and concupiſcence. For as Chriſt ſayth: *Vvhoſoeuer ſinneth is a ſlaue to ſinne*: and being ſlaues to ſinne, vve vvere ſlaues to the diuel, vvho hath no authoritie nor provver ouer vs but by ſinne: and being ſlaues to the diuel vve vvere captiues of hel, vvhich is the priſon vvhere the diuel holdeth ſinners perpetually. And behold here briefly in vvhat bondage, by ſinne, the diuel had gotten vs. After that by ſinne vve vvere deſpoiled of grace, if he tempted vs vve could not haue reſiſted, and if vve had fallen by ſinne, vve could not haue riſen again by force of nature, & force of grace vve had none, becauſe ſinne had depriued vs of it: and ſo vve vvere ſlaues to ſinne, and the diuel, and captiues alſo and priſoners of hel, vvhich is devv to ſinne: vvherfore S. Paul ſayth: that *VVe vvere deteyned captiues, at the diuels pleaſure.*

Mannes ſeruitude after ſinne.
The cauſe of mans ſeruilitie.
Rom 6.
Io. 8.
1. Io. 8.
2. Pet 2.
Rom. 6.
Mans bondage to the diuil.
Th. 1. 2. q. 109. 6. 7.
1. Tim. 2.

3. To ranſome this priſoner, & to redeme this bondſlaue by vvay of æquitie and iuſtice, it vvas neceſſarie that a Diuine Perſon ſhould become man: for God only could not ſatisfie, becauſe he vvas God, & could be indebted to none: Man only vvas not able to pay ſo great a ranſome, as ſinne required: only God & man, vvas a fitte pay-maſter. For as S. Leo ſayth if he had not bene true God, he could not haue giuen vs a remedie, and if he had not bene true man, he could not haue giuen example, yea he could not haue ſuffered, and ſo could not haue ſatisfied.

Mannes Redeemer.
Ser. 1. Nat. Domini.
None but a Diuine Perſon could pay mans rãſome.

4. And amongſt the three Diuine Perſons, the ſecond vvas the fitteſt. For who fitter to be a mediator then the midle Perſon? Who fitter to be the Sonne of man by incarnatiõ, then he who from al eternitie vvas the Sone of God? Who fitter to repaire the image of God in man, then he who was the image of his Father? Vvho fitter to make an amendes for Adames inordinate deſire of knowledge then he vvho vvas the wiſdome of his Father? Who fitter to abate Adams pride, who would haue been like to God, then he who was in deed the likenes of

none fitter then the ſecond Perſon. vvhy?
Gen. 3.

God his Father, & yet by incarnation, of purpose became in outward show as vnlike him, as man is to God? Briefly who fitter to appease the storme, then Ionas for whom the storme was rayſed? for it was no other then the Sonne of God for whom the storme in heauen was raiſed, when Lucifer would be like the Higheſt. It was no other then the ſame Sonne of God, for whom in paradiſe that ſtorme aroſe, when Adam puffed vp with pride, would be like to God in knowledge of good & euil; for to him is proper the likenes and image of God, vvhich they inordinatly affected.

5. The ancient then of yeares became a child, the Word was mute, God became man, the ſecond and midle Perſon played the mediator, the Sonne of God became the Sonne of man, and in mans nature which he had taken vpon him, repayred what man had ruined, and deſtroying ſinne by fleſh, vvhich by fleſh was committed, ouercame the diuel by fleſh, by vvhich he had ouercome: and whereas with one teare, yea one worde he might haue remedied vs, he would ſheed his bloud for vs, and vvheras one drop had bene ſufficient, he powred out al, to ſhew the greatneſſe of his charitie, and the greatnes of our ingratitude, vvhich ſtil commit ſinnes, that coſt Chriſt ſo dearly, to ſhew the malice of ſinne, whoſe ſtaine could not be taken out without the bloud of this lamb, and to ſhewe the greatnes of the ranſom, and the price of our redemption.

The great price of our redemption.

6. So great was this price vvhich was payd for vs, that S. Peter ſayth *Vve vvere redemed not by gold and ſiluer, but by the precious bloud of Chriſt.* And S. Paul ſayth *that vve vvere bought by a great price:* ſo great, that Dauid calleth it *copioſa redemptio, a copious redemption. Prorſus copioſa* (ſayth S. Bernard) *quia non gutta, ſed vnda ſanguinis per quinque partes corporis manauit* Copious in deed becauſe not a drop, *but a ſtreame of bloud, iſſued out at fiue parts of his body, ſo rich a price vvas this bloud* (ſayth he) *that it vvas ſufficient to haue ſatisfied for the ſinne vvhich shed it.* So that Chriſt is our Redemer. *Vvho hath deliuered vs out of the povver of darkenes,* fried vs from the ſlauerie of ſinne, and the bondage of the diuel. For (as S. Auſtin ſayth) Chriſt now hath tyed the diuel in a chaine, ſo that he can no farther tempte vs, then we can reſiſt: barke he may, tempt he may, ſollicite vs he may, but byte he can none but thoſe, which wilfully caſt them ſelues vvithin his reach.

1. Pet. 1.
1. Cor. 6.
Pſal. 129.
Ser. 22 in Cat.
Ep. 290.
Col. 1.
Ser. 197. Domin. 1. poſt Trinitatem.

7. Who now is ſo vngratful as not to acknowledge this benefit? Vvho wil arrogate vnto him ſelfe the name of a Chriſtian, and wil not alſo acknowledge Chriſt for his Redeemer? Dare now the reformers deny

mers deny Christ the title of a Redeemer? they dare not. Yet by their doctrin they make him a most absurd Redemer and so more dishonour him, then if they had denyed him this title altogether.

8. For they say, that there is no iustice but Christs iustice, no good workes but his workes, no merit but his merit, no satisfaction but his, and consequently, that Christs passion was our iustice, our merit, and our satisfaction. Out of which doctrin they inferre, first that neither there is any inherent iustice or sanctitie in man, neither is there any necessarie at al, because Christs iustice is ours by imputation, and that is sufficient. So (sayth Caluin) and to him subscribeth Luther as shal appeare by their wordes, vvhich shalbe related and refuted in the next chapter, as also in diuers chapters of the seuenth book. Secõdly they gather out of the same doctrin that good workes are not necessarie because Christs workes are ours & they are sufficient: which doctrin I shal lay open in the same next chapiter. Thirdly hence they inferre also that no lawes, either humaine or diuine, can bind vs in conscience, because Christs Passion was the ransome, which fried vs from al lawes. Fourthly that we are bond to no satisfaction, because Christs satisfaction was sufficient. Fifthly that no sinnes nor euil workes can hurt vs, because Christs iustice being ours, no sinne can make vs sinners, which doctrin, shal be set downe in the same booke. Sixtly that no hel nor iudgement remaineth for vs: because Christs iustice being ours, sinnes can neither be imputed to vs in this life nor punished in the next. And in these pointes they say, that Christian libertie consisteth. So that Christ according to these doctors opinions, hath redemed vs from the slauery of sinne, because his iustice being ours no sinne can hurt vs, he hath deliuered vs from the yoke of the law, because no law can bynd vs, he hath deliuered vs from hel and the diuel because howsoeuer we liue, if we beleue that Christs iustice is ours, and our satisfaction, and payment, the diuel hath no powre to punish vs in his hellish prison, because Christ hath suffred the payne dew to our sinnes before hand.

The reformers denie inherent iustice in the iust.

l 5. Inst. c. 11. 2.

Luth. in 2. Gal fol. 298.

The second absurditie.

The third.

The fourth.

The fifth.

The sixt.

How they say Christ hath redemed vs.

9. Vvherin the discreet reader may easily perceiue what an absurd Redemer they make Christ to be. For if Christ hath redeemed vs from the slauery of sinne, because no sinne can hurt vs, then doth he open vs the gappe to al maner of sinnes & outrages. For who wil care for sinne, that is perswaded, that Christs passion is so imputed to him, that no sinne can hurt him? If Christ hath redemed vs from the yoke of the law, because no law now can bynd vs in conscience; then doth he giue

They make Christ an absurd redemer, in that they make his passion a cause of sinne, & trãsgression.

he giue vs the occasion to transgresse freely, and contemne boldly al maner of lawes and ordinances. If Christ hath deliuerd vs from hel, because he hath payed the punishement dew to sinne, and requireth no other satisfaction at our handes, then doth he in a maner egge vs forward to al vice, from vvhich no man wil absteyne, if feare of hel do not bridle his vnruly appetites, and kepe him in awe. And so Christs passion vvhich was a sacrifice to abolish sinne, is a cause of al sinne, and Christ who came to reedeme the world from sinne, filleth the world with sinne, and so is an absurd Redemer, so to redeme vs from sinne, that he inuiteth vs and eggeth vs forwardes vnto sinne.

An example.

10. So they make Christ not vnlike to that father, who seeing the excessiue expences of his prodigal sonne, doth not command him to vse more thriftines, but payeth before hand to al disers, cookes, Inkeepers, and merchantes, al that possibly he can loose at dise, or lauish out in apparel, or consume in banquetting: wherin he doth nothing else but inuite his sonne to al vnthriftines, who needeth neuer to care how he spendeth, when al his debtes are payed before hand. For so the Gospellets say, that Christ perceiuing, that we could not keepe the law, freed vs from al lawes, and seing that we could not auoyd sinne, imputed his owne iustice so vnto vs, that no sinne can hurt vs, and knowving that vve vvere not able to satisfie for sinne, he abode the pain him selfe, and vvould haue none required at our hands. And in so doing, vvhat else hath he doone, but opened the vvide gate to al licencious libertie, vice and iniquitie.

The reasonable opinion vvhich Catholique haue of Christes passion.

11. Hovv farre more reasonable is the opinion of the Catholique Church, vvhich affirmeth that Christes Passion vvas not our formal iustification nor satisfaction, but only the meritorious cause of our redemption and saluation: vvhich deserued for vs at Gods handes grace, by vvhich together vvith our cooperation, we may be redeemed and saued. For as vve fel by our ovvne vvilles into captiuitie: so Christ thought it good, that by our owne willes together vvith his grace (for without his grace, we may fal, but we can not rise again) we should rise vp again, and wind our selues out of the seruitude of sinne, and the tiranie of the diuel. So that Christ hath redemed vs from the seruitude of the law, not that the law bindeth vs not, but because Christ hath taken away the heauinesse of the law, and by his grace vvhich he giueth vs, hath giuen vs force easily to fulfil it, which otherwise would haue tiranniſed ouer vs, in commanding more then we should haue bene able to haue performed. Christ also hath redemed

Assimilitude.

Hovv Christ hath redemed vs from the Lavve.

vs from

vs from captiuitie and bondage of ſinne, not becauſe no ſinne can be imputed vnto vs, but becauſe his paſſion hath deſerued grace for vs, by vvhich vve may diſpoſe our ſelues to iuſtification, vvhich is a reſurrection from ſinne to nevvneſſe of life, and by vvhich vve may auoid ſinne vvhenſoeuer vve are moued thereunto. Chriſt alſo hath freed vs from the tyrannie of the diuel and captiuitie of hel, becauſe he hath procured vs grace, by vvhich vvhen the diuel by him ſelfe, or the vvorld, or the fleſh prouoketh vs, vve may reſiſt, maugre al the force of hel. Chriſt alſo hath ſatisfyed for our ſinnes, not becauſe his paſſion vvithout any cooperation on our part doth ſuffice, for ſo, as is proued, the gate vvere opened vnto al iniquitie, but becauſe his paſſion had obteyned grace for vs, vvithout vvhich vve could not ſatisfie for the leaſt venial ſinne, & by vvhich, if vve cooperate therevvith, by faſting, almesdeds, prayer, and other vvorkes of pænance, vve may ſatifie for al our ſinnes, and al the paynes devv to our ſinnes.

From ſinne.

From the diuel.

12. So that Chriſt hath redemed vs from the ſeruitude and heauy yoke of the law, and yet we muſt kepe the lavv, and now eſpecially, becauſe the heauineſſe therof is taken a way by Chriſt his grace. Chriſt hath fried vs from the ſeruitude of ſinne, & yet we muſt auoide ſinne, and now eſpecially, becauſe Chriſts grace hath giuen force to ariſe by pęnance from our former ſinful life, and to walke in the way of his commandementes, and newnes of life. Chriſt alſo hath deliuered vs from the tyrannie of the diuel, becauſe he hath giuen vs grace to reſiſt him; wherfore we muſt not yeeld vnto him, but now eſpecially we muſt ſtand againſt him. Chriſt alſo hath ſatisfied for vs, and yet we muſt ſatisfie, and now eſpecially becauſe he hath giuen vs grace by vvhich we may do pænance for ſinne, and ſatisfie for the payne. For although that Chriſt hath payed the price of our redemption, yet would he haue vs to applie it by our cooperation not only in faith (for ſo he ſhould open the way to al vice) but in pœnance, in obſeruation of the commandementes, and receiuing of the Sacramentes. Wherfore our Redemer him ſelfe, who fried vs from the yoke of the law, yet commandeth vs to kepe the law *if vve meane to enter into life*; and although he hath ſatisfied for our ſinnes, yet he commandeth his Apoſtles to preach penance vnto vs, neceſſarie for remiſſion and ſatisfaction of our ſinnes.

Not vvithſtanding that Chriſt hath redemed vs yea vve muſt kepe the lavv.

Auoid ſinne.

Pſal. 118.

Reſiſt the diuel.

Do pænance.

Mat 19.

Luc. vlt.

13. And if he had redemed vs in that maner which the Goſpellers imagin, and had ſet vs at that libertie, that no law can bynd vs, nor ſinne hurt vs, & that no good workes, nor ſatisfaction, nor any other

The cõcluſion.

cooperation besides faith, can be required on our part, then had he bene a most absurd Redemer (as I haue already proued) and had rather tumbled vs dovvne into the depth of sinne and damnation, then Redemed vs.

The third Chapter shevveth hovv by their doctrin they make Christ no Redemer at al.

Mat. 7.

Heretikes are disguised vvolues.

VEL did our blessed Sauiour compare heretikes vnto Vvolues wrapped and inuested in sheepe-skinnes, vvhose maner hath alvvayes bene vnder prætence of religion, to vtter blasphemie, and then to meane and intend the worst, vvhen they speake faireſt. Vvhat I pray you, is so common in our Gospellers mouthes, as that Christ only is our Redemer, and sole Mediator? Vnder which pretenre they condemne al honour giuen vnto Saincts, and abandon al prayer and intercession made to them, as iniurious to Christ & his title of a Redemer. In vvhich truly they seme not vnlike to Iudas, who vvould needs kisse Christ vvhen he meant to betray him; and me thinkes (and vvhat I think I shal proue anone) in this point they resemble the Ievves, vvhich inuested Christ like a King, called him King, and adored him as King, yet in deed derided him as a foole. For so these men cal Christ the Redemer, and rather then they vvil not seme to meane so, they take from the Saincts, the mother, and frends of Christ, al secondarie mediation and intercession, and vvil seme to be so zealous of Christes honour, that they vvil haue none honoured but him: and yet in deede vnder this faire shovv, they cary false hartes, & euen then vvhen they cal him and adore him as a Redemer, they robbe him and despoile him of that honourable title.

Not vnlike to Iudes and the Ievves.

Luthers and Caluins doctrine of imputatiue Iustice.

Lut. in com. Gal fol 298.

2. Luther in his cõmentaries vpon the second Chapter to the Galathiãs sayth plainly, that *Christ apprehended by faith is Christian iustice for vvhõ God reputeth vs iust* Caluin also subscribeth that our iustice cõsisteth *in the imputation of Christes iustice vnto vs.* And because this iustice is extrinsecal and is not inherent in vs, they say that though for Christes sake vve be reputed iust, yet the holiest that is, is a greuous sinner, & al his vorkes are vvorthy nothing else but damnation, vvhich doctrin hereafter di-

uerse.

uerse times, and especially in the seuenth booke shalbe related, hence it is also that they say, that our sinnes are only couered with Christes iustice, which is imputed vnto vs, but are not taken away nor extinguished. This they explicate by a similitude: for (say they) as if a man looke through redde glasse, al semeth redde, be it blacke or white, so God beholding vs through Christes iustice, repureth vs iust though in deed we be sinners. And this, Caluin in his preface of his Institutions a voucheth not to derogate frō Christ, but to make much for his honor, for what (sayth he) is to Christ more honourable then to acknowledge our selues despoiled of al vertue, that of him we may be clothed, that is, reputed iust for iustice which is imputed vnto vs. But let vs see how honorable this is to Christ. *3. Inst. c. 1. 2.* *Aboue in the first chap.*

3. I wil not deny but that it is honorable to Christ, and expedient for vs, to acknowledge that of our selues without Christes grace we are sinners and can do litle else but sinne, but to say that notwithstanding Christes grace which he hath bestowed on his iust, and is ready to bestow on al repentant sinners, we are stil sinners, & only reputed iust for Christes iustice, which is by fayth apprehended, & by God imputed vnto vs: is most dishonorable to Christ. For if we haue no other iustice then Christs iustice, which is imputed vnto vs, then haue we no internal sanctitie in vs, then are we not truly sanctified, then are we stil sinners be we neuer so iust. Caluin and Luther, and al the Lutheranes, and Caluinists haue no other answer to this then *concedo totum*: I grant al. *Th. 1. 2. q. 109.*

4. Are we then stil truly sinners and not truly iust? then was the first Adam more potent in malice, then the second in grace and sanctitie: for he made vs truly sinners, Christ could not make vs truly iust. Then was S. Paul deceiued who sayth, that Christs grace exceeded Adams sinne. Are we stil sinners and not truly sanctified? then hath not Christ verily redemed vs from the seruitude of sinne, *for whosoeuer is in sinne, is a slaue to sinne.* If we be not redemed from sinne, then are we not fried from the tyrannie of Satan, whose only title is sinne, by which he domineereth ouer vs. And seing that hel followeth sinne, as a iust punishment for such a fault, then are we stil captiues and prisoners of hel, and Christ is no Redemer, who hath neither redemed vs from sinne, nor hel, nor damnation. *Out of their doctrine of imputatiue Iustice followeth that Christe is no Redeemer. Rom. 5. Io. 8.*

5. The same Gospellers affirme, that by sinne our nature is so weakened, that not withstanding Christes grace, we can not resist any tẽptation of the flesh or diuel, that we can not possibly fulfil the law and

First chap. The conclus.

cómandementes, that we can not do any good worke, but must needs sinne in al our actiõs, as shal appeare by their doctrin & their words in the seuenth booke, which if it be true, then are we not by Christ fried from the diuels tyrannie vvho stil so tyranniseth ouer vs, that vve can resist none of his tentations; then are we stil slaues to our ovvne concupiscence and sensualitie, whose assaults we can not withstand; then are we bondemen of sinne, which so ouerruleth vs, that we can do no other thing but sinne: then are vve not deliuered from hel and damnation, vvhich God hath prouided against sinners. And so the fayre-spoken Christians, which cal Christ the sole Mediator and only Redemer, make him no Redemer at al.

The fourth chapter shevveth, hovv by their doctrin they make Christ no spiritual Phisitian.

Means perfit health of body and soule in paradise.

GOD created man in good plight, sound, whole and immortal, bestowing on him a tree of life, vvhose frute should haue preserued him from diseases, distemperatures, and death of body, & indevving him vvith original iustice, vvhich if he had kept, it had kept him, and preserued him in perpetual health of soule. But he not knovving hovv to vse such felicitie, by a surfet vvhich he tooke of the forbidden frute, distempered his body vvith mortalitie, vvhence proceed diseases, infirmities, and death it selfe, & cast him selfe at one tyme into no fevver then fovvre diseases of the soule, vvhich Diuines commonly cal *Vulnera animæ the vvounds of the soule*, vvhich reside also in fovvre partes or faculties of the soule. The vnderstanding vvhose obiect is truth, and vvhose perfection is knovvledge, was obscured vvith ignorance. The wil whose marke at vvhich she aymeth, is good, and vvhose perfection is loue, vvas infected vvith malice. The irascible part vvhose obiect is difficultie, and vvhose glorie is victorie ouer difficulties, vvas vveakned vvith infirmitie: and the concupiscible part, vvhose obiect vvas moderate delight: and vvhose felicitie vvas contentment in the same, vvas galled vvith the itching, and ill pleasing sore of concupiscence.

Adams surfet

Four vvoũdes of the soule. Th. 2. q. 84. art. 3.

The vnderstãding vvounded vvith errors.

The vvil vvith malice.

The irascible part vvith infirmitie.

The concupis.

2. And Adam was the man of whom we tooke this infection,

vnhappy

vnhappy to him ſelfe, and vnlucky to vs, who poiſoning him ſelfe infected vs, and running him ſelfe through, wounded vs. For when this vnhappy wight deſcended from Hieruſalem to Hierico, that is from Paradiſe the place of peace and pleaſure, vnto this vale of miſery and changeable world, as murable as the Moone (vvhich the word Hierico importeth) he fel into the handes of theues, to wit the diuels, who deſpoiled him of his garment & coate of innocencie, & al ſupernatural habites and graces, and wounded him euen in natural perfection and faculties, which before by original iuſtice vvas much confirmed and perfited, and gaue him the fowre wounds afore mentioned, yet ſo, that they left him halfe a liue: not liuing the ſupernatural life of grace becauſe ſinne had bereued him of it, but yet liuing a natural life, becauſe he had loſt no natural perfection, though he was weakened and wounded alſo in that, becauſe he loſt original iuſtice which gaue no ſmal force and vigour euen vnto nature, and greater then nature of her ſelfe could haue had by nature. And whileſt, he lay thus ſpoiled and wounded, the Prieſt and Leuite paſſed by him, and gaue him no helping hand, that is the law & the Prophets could tel him the nature of the diſeaſe, but could giue him no grace to heale it.

cible vvith in ordinat concupiſcence.
Adam thus vvounded vs.
Luc. 12.
The parable applyed
Tho. ſupra
Beda.
Luc. 10.
Ibidem.

3. Wherfore the Samaritane Chriſt Ieſus (who when he vvas ſo called refuſed not the name) played the part of a merciful Phiſitian, by the oyle of his mercie and vvine of his bloud, vvhich he provvred into his vvounds, to cure him. So that if novv Hieremie demand of vs: *Nunquid reſina non eſt in Galaad aut medicus non eſt ibi? Is there not roſen in Galaad, or is not there a Phiſitian?* We can anſvver him quickly: yes Hieremie in Galaad the Church of Chriſt, vve vvant no roſen, ſalues, nor medecins, for vve haue ſeuen Sacramentes, vvhich al giue grace to heale al ſpiritual vvounds: and vve haue a Phiſitian vvhoſe name is IESVS, vvhich importeth ſaluation, who came not for the whole but the ſicke, not for the iuſt but for the ſinful, and vvho in al reſpects hath playd al the partes of a good Phiſitian.

Ioa. 8.
Hier. 7.
Luc. 5.
Th 3 p. q. 1. a. 3

4. Phiſitians are more in company with ſicke then with the whole, ſo was this ſpiritual Phiſitian, who one while conuerſed with Phariſies, an other while with harlotes, an other while with Publicanes, and alwayes almoſt with infirme patientes. Phiſitians haue their medicins, Chriſt hath his ſaluing Sacraments. Phiſitians to alure their patients to take the preſcribed potions, wil taſt of them firſt them ſelues, and Chriſt to make vs patiently to drink downe the bitter potion of perſecution and aduerſatie, which is ſoueraine for the ſoule,

The partes of a phiſitian applied to Chriſt.
Mat. 9.
Mat. 7.

first began him selfe vnto vs, that we might pledge him the more wil-
Christ sustei-ned the paine to cure vs. lingly. Phisitians to cure vs do some tymes launce and cut vs, some
times they prescribe vs fasting, and some times they let vs bloud: but
this Phisitiã in this point far exceedeth them. For they to diminish the
Mat. 4. disease wil bid vs fast, but wil not fast them selues. Christ fasted for vs
fourtie dayes and nightes to recure our surfet. They to ridde vs of su-
perflous humours, or corrupted bloud wil launce our flesh or let vs
bloud in a vayne, but wil not lose one drop of their owne bloud for
Christ vvas let bloud to make vs a potion. vs, but Christ permitted his owne flesh to be cut in his circuncision,
to be torne when the was whipped, and to be perced vvhen he was
crucified, and would be let blood euen at the hart, to make a potion
for our recouery. Other Phisitians seke to take away our disease, but
wil not take it vpon them to ridde vs of it: but Christ hath taken our
1. Pet. 2. sinnes vpon him to ease and ridde vs of them. He hath taken our ague
to him selfe, to take it from vs, not that he hath taken the malice of
our sinnes, but the payne of sinne vpon him, and hath *suffred it in his*
In an ague, is the disease & the paine. *body vpon the vvood of the crosse.* For as in a corporal ague there is the dis-
ease and the paine, and the disease or ague is a distemperature of heate
and humours, the paine is not the ague but the effect of it, so in the
In the agaue of some are thinges the di sease, and the paine. spiritual ague of the soule which is sinne, there is the malice of sinne,
vvhich is the disease, and this Christ could not take vnto him, because
he was incapable of sinne, and there is the paine also dew vnto sinne,
vvhich is not the ague, but a burning in Purgatorie or hel, if we do
not preuent it by other corporal and voluntarie paines & satisfaction.
Christe tooke the paine dew to sinne, but not the sinne. And this Christ tooke vpon him in suffering hunger, thirst, cold, and
other paynes which we had deserued, yea suffring death that we might
liue, and so by taking vpon him the paine dew to sinne, hath cured
the disease of sinne, and hath rid vs of our ague, by abiding the bur-
ning of the same. And hetherto we and the Gospelers agree, for they
also wil say, that Christ is the Phisitian of our soules, but yet their do-
ctrin is cleane contrarie, and so whileſt in words and shew, they seeme
to acknowledge him our Phisitian, in doctrine and in deed they make
him none at al.

See the third. chap of this booke. 5. For if you remember, Luther, and Caluin are of opinion that
we haue no inherent and internal iustice or sanctitie, but are iust
only by Christes owne iustice, vvhich (say they) marketh vs reputed
iust, but not in dede iust, hideth our sinnes but healeth them not, and
Imputatiue iustice makes couereth our spiritual wounds but cureth thē not. Which if it be true,
then certes is Christ no true Phisitian, who healeth not but hideth

only

only our sores and diseases. O blasphemie, ô ingratitude, ô iniurie, ô sacriledge couered with a pretence of religion! They wil seeme forsooth to atribute much to Christ, who as they say, hath made vs iust by his owne iustice, which he imputeth vnto vs, but whilest they acknowledge no other but Christs iustice imputed to vs, they are enforced to say, that Christ hath not verily sanctified vs, nor verily healed the spiritual sores & maladies of our soule, but hath only couered them and hidden them from the sight of God, by an imputation of his owne iustice, and so he may be a hider and couerer of our wounds, but no healer, nor Phisitian.

Christ no Phisitian.

The Conclusion.

The fifth Chapter shewveth howv they robbe Christ of the title of a Lavv maker.

IF Moyses for preseribing lawes vnto the Iewes, Licurgus vnto the Lacedemonians, Solon to the Athenians, Romulus to the Romains, Plato to the Magnesians, Trismegistus vnto the Egiptians, and others forgeuing lawes vnto their subiects, were so famous and renowmed: Vvhat honour must it be vnto our Sauiour Christ to haue bene the authour of the Christian law, and the lawgiuer vnto the Christians? They præscribed lawes only vnto some certaine people or nation, Christ vnto al nations. Their lawes had for their scope and proiect an external and ciuil peace, Christs law aymeth at an inward peace of the soule in earth, and an æternal peace in heauen? Their lawes forbad only external sinnes, as theefte, murder, adultery, and such like, litle respecting the inward desire and intention, Christes law restraineth euen the inward consent, desire, and dilight. Their lawes forbad not al vice, neither commanded or counsayled al vertues, for Platos lawes permitted wiues to be common, and other vices also: Licurgus his lawes vvere corrected as being toto rigorous, vvhich thing he tooke so heauily and so greeuously that he pined him selfe with abstinence: But Christes law either commandeth or counsayleth al vertues, not only moral but also Theological, and forbiddeth al vices vvhat soeuer. Vvherfore Dauid sayth, that *God his lavv is immaculate conuerting soules: immaculate*, because it permitteth no filth of sinne, conuer-

Lavv giuers.

Christ the Lavvgiuer to Christians.

Christ and his Lavv excelleth al other Lavvgiuers and lavves in many pointes.

Chrisost. ho 4 in Act.

Tertul. in Aplog.

conuerting soules: becauſe it induceth vs to al maner of vertue. Their lawes were ful ſo many ſuperſtitions and abſurd errors, for they commended many Gods to be worſhipped, and thoſe beaſts and ſerpents, and ſome of their wiſeſt, denyed Gods prouidence, as Ariſtotle, ſome his foreſight and preſcience, as Cicero: ſome made God the ſoule of the world, ſome confined him vvith in the heauens, ſome held the ſoule to be mortal. But the lavv of Chriſt *is Præceptum lucidum, illuminans oculos: a lightſome Præcept, illuminating the eyes*: that is illuminating our vnderſtanding, the eye of the ſoule vvith true fayth and knovvledge, and diſperſing al clouds of ignorance, errors, and ſuperſtition. And no meruaile, becauſe Chriſt the lavvgiuer vvas the vviſdom of his Father, and vvhen he gaue his lavv, he gaue his Spirit vvho *teacheth his Church al veritie.*

Auguſt. l. de Ciuit. l. de mundo.

Pſal. 18.

Io. 14.

The Sume of the Chriſtian lavv.

2. The lavv of Chriſt may be reduced to tvvo heades, to vvit, thinges that are to be beleeued, and things vvhich are to be obſerued.

VVhat vve beleue.

Vve beleue that there is a God, & him vve acknovvledge the only God and Creator and Ruler of al, vvho taketh account of al our actions and vvil accordingly hereafter revvard vs. And although vve beleeue alſo that this one God is three in Perſons, and that the ſecond Perſon vvas incarnate for vs, dyed that vve might liue euer, and roſe again for our Reſurrection, vvhich things are out of reaſons reach, yet are not theſe or any other of the Myſteries of our beleefe againſt reaſon, or vnbeſeming the Diuine Maieſtie, or repugnant to Philoſophie, as Diuines do proue, vvho do ſo explicate theſe Myſteries, as nothing appeare repugnant to reaſon, and ſo do anſvvere infidels obiections, as that they can conclude nothing euidently againſt vs. Yea Iuſtinus Martyr and S. Auſtin do ſhew, how the Platoniſts and other Philoſophers, taught the like vnto many of thoſe Articles vvhich Chriſtians beleeue. And as concerning thoſe thinges vvhich are to be obſerued, to wit the precepts of good life, they are reduced vnto tvvo, which are the loue of God aboue al thinges, and the loue of our neighbour as our ſelfe: which are moſt reaſonable, becauſe God is the chiefeſt good and ſo moſt of al to be beloued, and our neighbour is like vs in nature, and ordained to the ſame end to which we are, and ſo to be beloued as our ſelues: To our neighbour therfore we muſt do as we would be doone vnto, and therfore we muſt neither kil him, nor robbe him, not iniurie him in goods, life, or other thing, for our ſelues would not willingly be thus iniuried. And ſo we are forbiddéal ſinne againſt God, and al iniurie againſt man; yea we giue by our law to God, that

The credibilitie of Chriſtiã religion.

Apol 1. *ad Anton. l.* 19. *cap.* 6. 29.

VVhat vve are to do.

VVhat vve ovve to God.

VVhat vve ovve to our neighbour.

Which

which is dew to God, to wit, supreme honor because he hath supreme excellencie, supreme loue because he is the fountain of al goodnes, we yeeld him gratitude, because he is our best benefactor and redemer, feare because he is our Lord yea our Iudge. To men if they be superiors, we giue reuerence and obedience and that of conscience, to our æquals we owe charities, to our infetiors we condescend by a complying nature. Vve are forbidden not only to kil, but also to be angry, not only to abstein from adultery and fornication, but also from lasciuious lookes, yea desires, we are bidden not only not to offend our freinds, but also to loue our enemyes. And to induce vs to this, the two things vvhich conteine al common welthes in awe, to wit, paine and reward, are proposed vnto vs: payne in hel, reward in heauen, payne to feare, reward to hope for.

To God vve giue al Supremacie.

To men their devve.

Mat. 5.

3. No law more reasonable then this, none so perfect, which teacheth no errour, permitteth no vice, omitteth no good, but either cõmaundeth, or counsayleth it. And seing that Christ is the author of this law which surpasseth al laws, greater is his honour and renoume then euer was the honour of Plato, Licurgus, yea Moyses or any other. Wherfore the prophet Esaie recounting other titles of honour dew vnto Christ, amongst others calleth him a lavv-maker; *Dominus iudex noster, dominus legifer noster, dominus Rex noster: Our lord is our Iudge, Our lord, our lavv maker, our lord is our King.* If he be our Lavv maker he may make lawes to bynd vs, if he be our iudge he may pronounce sentence against the transgressors, and if he be our King he may punish vs, yea if he had called him only our King, it had been a sufficient argument to proue him a lavv-maker, because the principal meanes for a king to rule his subiects are his lavves and ordinaunces. Micheas speaking of the promulgation of Christs lavv at Hierusalem in Penthecost, sayeth, *That a lavv shal proceed from Sion & the vvord of God from Hierusalem.* The same Prophecie hath Esaie in the same words, and addeth that *Ilandes shal expect his lavv.* By which it is playne that Christ is a law-maker, who hath prescribed lawes, & therfore when he gaue his Apostles authoritie to baptise and preach, he bad them also to teach the Gentiles to kepe al those thinges, which he had commanded. And yet our Gospellers vvho bragge that they giue al to Christ, despoyle him of this honourable title, and auouch that he was a redemer only but no law-maker.

No Lavv like to the Christian lavv.

No Lavv-maker to Christe.

Isay 33.

6. 4. c. 4.

c. 2.

c. 4. 2. 42.

Mat. 5.

See the first chap. of this booke.

Luther saith Christ. Was no Lavv-maker.

4. Luther sayth plainly that *it is the office of the lavv to cõmand, threaten and terrifie, but the office of Christ is only to embrace sinners, vvho haue transgressed the lavv.*

in c. 2 ad Gal.

Ibidem. the lavv. Yea sayth he: *If vve make Christ an exactour of the lavv, vve confound Christ and the lavv, and make him the minister of sinne* Wherfore thus he concludeth with this exhortation: *Quare Christum recte definias, non vt Sophista & Iustitiarij qui faciunt eum nouum legislatorem, qui abrogata veteri lege nouam tulerit, illis Christus est exactor & tyrannus: vvherfore define thou Christ a right, not as the Sophists do and the Iustitiaries* (so he calleth Catholiques because they affirme inherent iustice and auouch that, good workes are necessary) *vvho make him a nevv lavv-maker that hath abrogated the old lavv, and enacted a nevv: to them Christ is an exactour and atyrant.* How then I pray thee wouldst thou haue vs to define Christ? he sayth *that as it is the art of Christians not to care for lavves nor to imagin, that I bynd in conscience so is it an hard art, vvhich I* (sayth he) *my selfe can hardly learne: to define Christ after this manner.* But yet this great Logician, at length giueth vs this definition of Christ: *Christus autem definitiue non est legislator sed propitiator & saluator: But Christ definitiuely is not a lavv-maker, but a propitiatour, and Sauiour.* By vvhich doctrin it is playne, that Luther is of opinion, that Christ came not to terrifie vs, to or exact any law at our handes, but only to embrace the transgressors, so that they beleue only that he is their Redemer from the law, which doctrin how it openeth the gap to vice, I shal hereafter declare: here I only note that Luther despoyleth Christ of the title of a Lawmaker, and auoucheth that he neither made law, nor exacteth any law at our hands, which how iniutious it is to Christ, may appeare by the commendation, vvhich is due to Christ and his law.

Ibidem.

The arte vvhich Luther teacheth Christians.

Ibidem.

Hovv Luther defineth Christ

See the seuēth booke c. 7.

l. 1. Inst. c. 11. 12. 19.

Caluins difference betvvixt the old lavv and the nevv.

5. Caluin putteth this difference betwixt the old and the new law, that the old promised grace and glorie with this condition if we kepe the commandements, but the new law promiseth these things absolutely without that condition. So that Caluin thinketh that glory and saluation is promised by Christ, whether we obserue the law or no, and consequently he thinketh, that no law byndeth vs vnder payne of damnation. Whence it foloweth, that Christ neither exacteth, neither prescribeth any law vnder payne of damnation, and so is no law maker. And the same Caluin after that he had discoursed of Christian libertie, which he sayth consisteth in a freedom from al lawes, concludeth thus: *vve conclude that they are exempted* (he speaketh of the faythful) *from al lavves.* Whence it must needs folow that Christ is no Lawmaker for where there is no obligatiō there is no law (as shal be proued hereafter) where no law, there is no Law-maker, and therfore if Christ exacteth no law at our handes, and byndeth vs to none, he can by no right haue the name of a Law-giuer or Law-maker.

Caluin makes Christ no lavv maker.

l. 3. Inst. c. 19. 9. 10.

6. Let

6. Let the Prophet Esaie therfore looke how he calleth Christ our *Lavv-maker*, yea let Christ him self correct and amend that saying of his: *Mandatum nouum do vobis, vt diligatis inuicem. I giue you a nevv lavv and commandement, that you loue one an other*: A new lavv (sayth S. Austin) Christ giueth vs, because although it be old, as being commanded in the old lavv, yet it is nevv, either because Christ hath annexed nevv grace vnto it, which in the old law it had not, or because by this grace annexed, it maketh vs nevv creatures, vvho before vvere old by sinne: or else (sayth S. Clement) it is a nevv lav, because Christ hath renevved it. Let him also remember his office better, vvhich (as Luther and Caluin say) is not to prescribe or exact lavves, but to imbrace the trasgressours. He forgot therfore his office, vvhen he bad vs *Keepe the commandementes if vve vvil enter into life*: and vvhen he corrected the olde lavv, commanding vs not only not to kil, but not to be angry, not only to loue our friends, but our enemies also.

c. 33. legisl. *Io. 13.* *l. 3. cont. ep. par. c. 2.* *l. 6. Const. Apost. c. 3. 2.* *Mat. 19.* *Mat. 5.*

7. See, see, what open iniurie, against the playne text of Scripture, yea and against al reason also, these men are not afrayed to offer vnto Christ, in taking from him the title and office of a Lavvmaker. For if he could make no lavv, he was inferior to the meanest Prince in the world: vvho established a common vvealth, his Church, but hath no authoritie to command his subiects, who instituted Sacramentes, yet could make no law to bynd vs vnto them, and therfore when he threatneth damnation to them, that vvil not receiue his Baptisme, and protesteth that we shal haue no life, vnlesse *vve eate his flesh* and *drinke his bloud*, we may boldly contemne such peremptorie commandementes, because if Christ be no Law-maker, he could make no law, and where no law is, there is no obligation, and where is no obligation al men are as frie, as they who are Lordlesse and subiect to none.

Open iniurie against Christ. *Io. 3.* *Io. 6.* *The Conclusions.*

The sixt Chapter shewveth howu they despoile Christ of the title of an eternal Priest, according to the order of Melchisedech.

The necessitie of a priest.

ALmightie God being highly offended, and iustly displeased, that so meane a creature as man, should contemne his commandement, and not care for his displeasure, it was necessary that a Priest should be found out, vvho by some pleasing Sacrifie, should appease this his indignation so iustly conceiued. And many Priestes in deed haue assaied by diuerse sacrifices to pacifie God thus angry, but haue al fayled of their intended purpose. For neither were they of that authoritie, as to be Mediators betvvixt God and man, for such a reconciliation, neither were their Sacrifices of that vvorth, as to make amends for so great a fault.

The insufficiencie of the priest of the old lavv.

2. Wherfore God by his Prophetes complayneth of their insufficiencie, saying that he *is ful, and cloyed vvith the multitudes of their sacrifices,* and telleth them plainly that if *they offer vnto him Holocaustes and vowes of fatlinges he vvil not looke at them.* Because (sayth he) God is not *delighted in such sacrifices.* Yea so insufficient were al the Priestes of the old law, that God by his prophet Ezechiel threatneth, that he wil put them out of office, and in steed of so many he wil giue vs one Priest, and Pastor, Christ IESVS, whom he calleth his seruant Dauid, because as man he descended lineally from Dauid, and in respect of his humaine nature, he was Gods seruant and inferior.

Isa. 1.
Amos 5.
Psal. 50.
c. ap. 34.
Philip. 2.

Christ the preest.

3. This Priest, Christ IESVS, is the high Priest, and the only high Priest of the new law. For although in the lavv of Moyses it was necessary to haue many high Priestes, because (as S. Paul sayth) their mortalitie would not permit them to liue and remayne alwayes, and because death put them out of office, it was necessarie that others should succeed them in the same authoritie. And so the first of this ranke and line of Priestes vvas Aaron (for Moyses vvas extraordinary) to whom Eleazarus and others succeded, to the number of fovvrscore and odde: yet in the nevv lavv one christ Iesus is sufficient, vvho though he haue many vicegerentes, vvhich are Bishops and Priestes

Heb. 7.
Ioseph. l. 20. Ant. c. 8.
Tol. in c. 18. Ioan.

of the

of the nevv lavv, yet hath he no ſucceſſors. For no man ſuccedeth to an other, vnles the other either dye, or giue ouer his office: vvherfore ſeing that our Sauiour Chriſt, though he dyed yet roſe again, neuer to dy agayn, and neuer ſurrendred or gaue ouer his office, but ſtil offereth Sacrifice, ſtil baptiſeth, ſtil miniſtreth Sacramentes, and ruleth and gouerneth his Church by his vicars and miniſteres, he hath no high Prieſt that ſuccedeth him, but is the ſole and only High Prieſt of the nevv lavv, far exceding al the Popes, Biſhops, and Prieſts that euer vvere.

Chriſte hath no ſucceſſor.

Chriſt the only high prieſt.

4. For his prieſtly authoritie (as diuines ſay) vvas not grounded vpon a caracter, vvhich other Prieſtes receiue in the Sacrament of Order, but vpon hypoſtatical vnion, by vvhich he vvas the Sonne of God: his authoritie extended not it ſelfe to Chriſtianes only, or them that are baptiſed, as the Popes & Churches authoritie doth, vvho haue no iuriſdiction ouer them that are out of the Church, and vvho neuer were baptized, but alſo euen vnto Infidels, vvhom he commandeth to receiue fayth, and the Sacrament of Baptiſme: by his Prieſtly povver he inſtituted Sacraments, eſtabliſhed a Church and Paſtors, and preſcribed a monarchical gouerment, vvhich ordonances the Church obeyeth but can not alter: by his authoritie he could giue grace vvithout Sacraments as he did to S. Mathevv, Marie Magdalen and others: vvheras the Pope Biſhops and Prieſts of the Church giue no grace infallibly but by Sacraments. And this is the Prieſt vvho for the dignitie of his Perſon, and the valevv of his Sacrifice, vvas the only Prieſt vvho could appeaſe Gods vvrath and indignation.

The differences betvvixt the prieſthood of Chriſt, and others.

1. Cor. 5.

Mat. 19.

Luc. 7.

Chriſt the only preeſt vvho vvas able to appeaſe God his anger.

5. This Prieſt muſt nedes be hard becauſe the dignitie of his Perſon ſuffereth no repulſe, & the worth of his Sacrifice was vnſpeakable, the ſame that offered the ſacrifice, vvas the God vvho vvas angry and & he to whō was offred the Sacrifice. The Prieſt was more holie, then is the perſon for vvhom the Sacrifice vvas offered vvas malicious, and the Sacrifie vvas more pleaſing to God, then the ſinne diſpleaſing. So precious vvas the Sacrifice that if Chriſt had put the Sacrifice in one ballance, and the ſinne in the other, it vvould haue ouer vvayed ſinne, as a thing of no vveight, vvhich notvvithſtanding is ſo heauy that it vveyeth dovvn to hel. For if euery operation of Chriſt be it neuer ſo litle, becauſe it vvas *Theandreke* that is the operation of God and man, vvas of infinite valevv, by reaſon of the dignitie of the Perſon: vvhat ſhal vve ſay of that heroical operation of Chriſts Paſſion, vvhich vvas an act of ſingular charitie, couragious fortitude, inuincible patience,

Heb. 5.

Rom. 5.

Iob. 6.

The Valeur and merit of Chriſtes operations.

Io. 15.

Phil. 2.

perfect obedience, and sacred religion, for it vvas a Sacrifice?

Christ offered. 6. This Priest offered two Sacrifices, the one at his last supper, vnbloudy, the other vpon the Crosse, bloudy, or rather one and the
2. Sacrifices. same Sacrifice (in respect of the thing vvhich was offered) after diuers
The first at his last Supper. manners, and vnder diuers formes. For in his last supper he offered
The Second on the Crosse. his sacred body and bloud after an vnbloudy manner, on the crosse he offered the same after a bloudy maner, at his last supper he offered his body, and bloud, vnder an other forme, that is vnder the formes of bread, and wine, on the crosse he offred the same in their owne forme
Heb 7. 9. and likenes. The bloudy Sacrifice was but once to be offered, because it was so precious that one oblation vvas sufficient. But because it was offered only as a general cause of al grace, & price of our redemption, it vvas conuenient that this general cause, should be determined by more particular causes, and that this price should be more determinately applyed, as by Sacramentes, fayth, and good works: so by the vnbloudy Sacrifice of the Masse. Yea because the Sacrifice of the
The necessitie of the first Sacrifice. crosse being bloudy, could not be repeated after Christs resurrection, he then being impassible and immortal, it was conuenient that an vnbloudy Sacrifice should also be offered continually in the Church, for
See the fourth booke. ch. 2. the worship of God and exercise of religion, vvhich (as I shal proue in the fourth booke) can not stand without a Sacrifice. By the bloudy Sacrifice Christ was a Priest and high Priest, but neither according vnto the order of Aaron (because that Priesthood by Christs Passion vvas abrogated and was confined whithin the Tribe of Leuie, of vvhich Christ was not) neither according to Melchisedech, because there was no similitude nor agrement in their Sacrifices.

Psal 109. 7. Wherfore seing that our Sauiour was a Priest according to the order of Melchisedech (for God affirmeth it with oth, and the Propher Dauid, and the Apostle S. Paul auouch it) we must needs haue a
Heb. 7. Sacrifice, by which he resembled his Sacrifice, and was a Priest accor-
The Conueniences betvvixt Christ and Melchisedech. ding to his order. And this S. Paul proueth at large by diuers conueniences which were betwixt these two Priests & their Sacrifices. For as Melchisedech was a King and Priest, and a King of Salem, that is of peace, so was Christ. As Melchisedech hath neither father nor mother recorded in Scripture, so Christ as man had no father, and as God no mother: As Melchisedechs Priesthood descended not by carnal generation, so neither did Christes Priesthood. As Melchisedechs priesthood was æternal, because neither the begining nor ending is set
Ps. 109. downe in Scripture, so Christs Priesthood hath no end as Dauid affirmeth.

firmeth. As Melchiſedechs Prieſthood vvas of higher perfection, then the Prieſthood of Aaron (for Melchiſedech bleſſed Abraham and in him the whole Tribe of Leuie, vvhich argueth ſuperioritie) ſo was Chriſt and his Prieſthood farre aboue Aaron and his Prieſthood. Laſtly as Melchiſedech offered a Sacrifice of bread and vvine, ſo Chriſt offered his body and bloud in his laſt ſupper vnder the formes and accidents of bread and wine. And this laſt conuenience, is that for which Chriſt eſpecially is ſayd to be according vnto the order of Melchiſedech, not that he is of the ſame order, or that his Sacrifice and Melchiſedechs are al one, for Chriſts Prieſthood and Sacrifice farre excelled his Prieſthood and his Sacrifice: but becauſe there is moſt reſemblance betvvixt them and their Sacrifices. And this laſt conuenience S. Paul expreſſed not, becauſe the Iewes, to whom he wrote, were not capable of ſo high a Myſterie, yet as the Fathers note he inſinuated it, when ſpeaking of Chriſt whom he had before called *Prieſt and Biſhop according to the order of Melchiſedech* he added: *Of vvhom vve haue great ſpeach and inexplicable to vtter, becauſe you are become vveake to heare.* Gen. 14. Heb. 7. *Chriſt is a Prieſt according to Melchiſedech by the Sacrifice of the Maſſe.* Heb. 5.

8. This dignitie of an eternal Prieſt according to the order of Melchiſedech, which the Prophet Dauid and the Apoſtle S. Paul giue vnto our Sauiour Chriſt, our Goſpellers (who vaunt that they giue al vnto Chriſt) ſacrilegiouſly take from him For although they grant that Chriſt offered a Sacrifice on the Croſſe, yet that is not ſufficient to make him an eternal Prieſt, nor according to the order of Melchiſedech. And this ſhal appeare moſt plainly by this argument. Betwixt a Prieſt and Sacrifice is a neceſſary relation, by which one inferreth the other: for as a father can not be without a ſonne, nor a maiſter without a ſeruant, ſo neither can a Prieſt be without a Sacrifice, becauſe a Prieſts principal office is to offer ſacrifices to God. And as no ſonne no father, no ſeruant, no Maiſter, ſo no Sacrifice, no Prieſt. And as a Prieſt can not be without a Sacrifice, ſo neither can an æternal Prieſt be without an æternal Sacrifice. Wherfore if Chriſt neuer offered other Sacrifice then that of the Croſſe, as our aduerſaries affirme, thē is he not a perpetual Prieſt, becauſe he hath no Sacrifice which either by him ſelfe, or by his miniſters is perpetually offered. Pſal. Heb. 5 7. *Our Goſpellers robbe Chriſt of the title of an eternal prieſt according to Melchiſedech. A prieſt and a Sacrifice are correlatiues.* Heb. 5.

9 To ſay that the Sacrifice of the Croſſe ſtil remayneth in effect, becauſe by that vve receiue grace and redemption, and from that our Sacramentes haue their efficacie, is not ſufficient. For the effects of this Sacrifice, are no Sacrifice, and the Sacrifice it ſelfe is not perpetual, becauſe it was but once offered, and ſo that Sacrifice is not ſufficient to *Thee Sacrifice of thee Croſſe is not ſufficient to make Chriſte an eternal Prieſt.*

ateording to Melchiſedech.

cient to make Chriſt an æternal Prieſt. Much leſſe can it make Chriſt a Prieſt according to the order of Melchiſedech, becauſe there is no reſemblance betwixt their Sacrifices. If our aduerſaries would grant, as Catholiques do, that Chriſt in his laſt ſupper offered him ſelf as a Sacrifice vnder the forme of bread and wine, I could eaſily ſee how Chriſt is an æternal Prieſt according to Melchiſedechs order, becauſe that Sacrifice is ſtil offered in the Maſſe by the handes of Chriſts miniſters, & altogether reſembleth Melchiſedechs Sacrifice. For though it be not bread and wine, at his was, yet hath it the formes of bread and wine, and is vnbloudy as his was.

That Melchiſedech did Sacrifice.

10. But rather then they wil grant this (ſuch is their hatred againſt the Maſſe) they wil deny, againſt plaine Scripture, that Melchiſedechs bread and wine was a Sacrifice. Yea againſt plaine Scripture, becauſe in the booke of Geneſis, Moyſes recoũteth vnto vs how Melchiſedech *brought forth bread & vvine, for he Was a Prieſt of God thehigheſt*, vvhich reaſon argueth that this bringing forth of bread & wine, vvas an offering of bread and vvine in maner of a Sacrifice: for if this bringing forth was but a prophane diſtribution of bread & wine amongſt Abrahames ſouldioars, vvhat conſequence had bene in that ſaing: *he brought forth bread and Wine, for he Was a Prieſt?* as wel might he haue ſayd, becauſe he was a barber: and better and more to the purpoſe ſhould he haue ſayd, becauſe he was a Baker, or an Inkeper, or a good houſe keeper: vvherfore vnles we wil ſay that Moyſes ſpake impertinently, we muſt affirme that his bread & wine was a Sacrifice. And if we hold Chriſt to be an æternal Prieſt and that according to Melchiſedechs order, vve muſt acknowledge that Chriſt ſtil offereth a Sacrifice in the Church, and that, vnder the formes of bread and wine.

Gen. 14.

Either the Maſſe is a Sacrifice or Chriſt is no æternal prieſt nor according to Melchiſedech.

Heb. 7.

11. Wherfore ſeing that our aduerſaries wil acknowledge no other Sacrifice then that of the Croſſe, they deny Chriſt to be an æternal Prieſt, and in that they auouch that Chriſt neuer offered any Sacrifice vnder the formes of bread and wine, leſt they ſhould be enforced to admit the Maſſe for a Sacrifice, they deny him to be a Prieſt according to the order of Melchiſedech. For although he agree with Melchiſedech in that as God, he had no mother, and as man, he had no father, as alſo in that he was a King and Prieſt, as he was, yet can he not be an æternal Prieſt vvithout an æternal Sacrifice, neither according to Melchiſedeches order, vnles he haue a Sacrifice like vnto his Sacrifice.

The Concluſion.

But both theſe pointes our aduerſaries deny, becauſe they vvil not admit the Maſſe, *ergo*, notvvithſtanding their bragging that they giue al

to Chriſt,

to Christ, they robbe him and despoyle him of that glorious title of an eternal Priest according vnto Melchisedeches order, vvhich S. Paul, and King Dauid giue vnto him, and God him selfe auoucheth, and confirmeth with an oth. *Psal. 109. Heb. 7.*

The seuenth chapter shevveth hovv they make him no Iudge of the quicke and the dead.

NOthing more frequent in Scripture, nor more common in the mouthes and hartes of true Christians, then the two Aduentes, or Comminges of Christ. The first Aduent he hath already performed in al humilitie. The second he wil performe in al maiestie and glory: the cause of the first was mercie, of the second iustice. In the first he vvas a meke as a lambe, in the second he wil be as terrible as a Lion. The first was to saue sinners, the second wil be to condemne sinners. In the first he exhorted vs to good, and dehorted vs from euil, in the second he wil reward the good, & punish the euil. Of the first Aduent prophecied Zacharie saying, *Behold thy King shal come vnto thee iust, and a Sauiour, Poore, and mounted on an asse* Of the second speaketh Daniel vvhen he sayeth, *he savv*, that is for saw, *one coming in clovvds like the Sonne of man, to vvhom the Ancient of dayes gaue Honour, Povver and a Kingdome.* Of the first speaketh Christ him selfe when he sayth: *God did not send his Sonne to iudge the vvorld, but that the vvorld might be saued by him:* Of the second speaketh the Prophet and Euangelist S. Iohn, vvhen he biddeth vs *behold Christ comming in cloudes, and telleth vs that euery eye shal see him, euen they vvho pricked him, and that al the tribes of the earth shal bevvayle them selues vpon him.* And of this Aduent speaketh Christ him selfe describing his owne comming to Iudgement in a terrible forme, and sayth, that *they then shal see the Sonne of man comming in a cloud vvith great povver and maiestie.* *Iohn. 3. Iohn. 5. Zach. 9. c. 7. Iohn. 3. Apoc. 1. Luc. 21.*

2. For vvant of vvitte to distinguish these tvvo Aduentes, and to apply them to the same Person at diuers tymes, some imagined that tvvo diuerse Persons were to come, the one called the sonne of Ioseph, who they say shalbe slaine in the battayle of Gog & Magog: the other called the sonne of Dauid, who shal reuiue againe (as they say) the sonne *The cause of the Ievves and others error concerning the comeing of Christ.*

Ex Petro Galat l 4. de Arcanis fidei Cath. c. 1.

sonne of Ioseph & shal redeeme Israel, & restore the Israelits to their Kingdome againe. Others hauing their eyes dasled with the splendor of the second Aduent, can not see the first which is base and humble, and therfore say (which is the common voice of the Iewes) that the Messias shal come like a temporal King in glorie and Maiestie, and by force of armes shal restore the Iewes to their former glorie, and because they haue not as yet seene such a Messias, they say that he is not yet come, but stil is expected. But by the Scriptures alleaged it is manifest that one and the selfe same Christ IESVS should come, first to saue the world and after to iudge the same. Wherfore S. Peter sayth,

Act. 10.

that Christ commanded him & his fellow Apostles *to preach to the People, and to beare witnes, that he it is (to wit who before came to redeme vs) who is constituted by God the Iudge of the liuing and the dead.* And Christ him self sayth,

Io. 5. Vide Maldon. in c. 5. Io.

that *God the Father iudgeth none (that is in a visible maner) but hath giuen al iudgement to his Sõne.* And lest that any should imagin, that Christ only as God is Iudge, but not as man, he addeth, that God the Father

Act. 17.

hath giuen him power to iudge vs because he is the Sonne of man. And S. Paul sayth, that God hath *appointed a day in which he will iudge the world by a man, whom he hath raysed from death to life.* So that the same Christ IESVS, who came first in humble maner to cal vs by his grace, & to receiue vs to his mercie, shal come againe in glorie, to giue vs our final sentẽce. And God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost shal Iudge vs, as well as God the Sonne, yet he only as man and as an vnderiudge shal iudge vs in a visible maner, and in this sense God the Father shal not iudge.

The same Christ cometh twise.

Christ the only visible Iudge, 2 Cor 5.

3. This Iudge shal giue sentence vpon al men, because as S. Paul sayth, we must al appeare before the tribunal and Iudgement-seate of Christ. This Iudge in this Iudgement shal exercise the three principal actes of a Iudge, to wit discussion, remuneration, and condemnation.

3. Actes of this Iudge.

Discussion of causes.

He shal discusse and examin the cause of euery one, and euery circumstance of the same, and therfore by the Prophet Ioel he sayth, that *he will dispute with vs.*

Ioel. 3.

A sore disputation.

A sore disputation, where the Creator disputeth and the creature answereth, where God that is offended will be the iudge and witnes, where the iudge is of such insight, that he seeth farther into the guilties cause, then he him selfe, & is so wachful that no excusing, cloking, or hiding, can deceiue him, so iust, that no bribes can corrupt him, so seuere, that no teares at that day can moue him, so resolute in his sentence, that no repreeue nor appellation can be admitted. This discussion and examination shal be doone in a trise, because it is nothing but a reuelation, and manifestation vnto our con-

How quicke this discussion shalbe.

sciences,

sciences, what euery one hath doone, which shal be so euident, that our selues shal accuse and crye guiltie, before the Iudge condemne vs. This examination and discussion the Iudge shal vse only vvith Christianes, because the cause of their condemnation (they being Christians) is not so manifest: and not with Infidels, because in that they want fayth, the cause of their condemnation is euident, and so no discussion shal be nessary. VVherfore S. Austin sayth: *Ad iudicium non veniunt, nec Pagani, nec Heretici, nec Iudei, quia de illis scriptum est, qui non credit, iam iudicatus est. To Iudgement do come neither Paganes, nor Heretiks, nor Iewes, because of them it is vvritten: he that beleueth not is already iudged*, that is in respect of discussion of his cause, he is already iudged, & nedeth not in the general iudgement any other discussion, for the cause of his exclusion from glorie, because his infidelitie is a cause most euident: yet (as some diuines affirme) for their other sinnes and for the diuersitie of their paynes, their cause also shal be discussed, not that God Knoweth it not without discussion, but because he wil make it known to the world.

VVhose cause shalbe discussed.

Serm. 33. de Sanct. Io. 3.

Vide Mald in c. 3. Ioan

D. Th. disp 53.

4. The second office of a Iudge which Christ shal exercice, is called the sentẽce of remuneration, which after the discussion of their causes and approbation of their merites, he shal pronouuce for the elect, in those most confortable words: *Venite benedicti Patris mei, percipite regnum &c. come you blessed of my Father, take possession of the Kingdome, vvhich vvas prepared for you, from the beginning of the vvorld.* The third office and action of a Iudge which Christ shal exercise, is the sentence of condemnation, which after examination of their crimes, God shal pronounce against wicked Christians, and faythles infidels also, because, *he that beleueth not shalbe condemned.* And this sentence shalbe pronounced by the mouth of Christ, & with an audible voice, in those terrible words which the Euangelist also hath set dovvne, *Ite maledicti in ignem aeternum*, &c. *Goe you accursed into euer lasting fire, vvhich is prepared for the diuel and his angels.* This is the honourable title & office of Christ, which the Gospellers also confesse in words and professe in their Creed, but in their other doctrin deny it, as I shal euidently demonstrate by their opinions and vvords, which take from Christ the three offices of a Iudge already alleaged.

The sentẽce of remuneration

Mat. 25.

The sentẽce of condemnatiõ.

Mat. 16.

Mat. 25.

5. And first of al to beginne with the last act and office vvhich a Iudge exerciseth, to wit, condemnation, Caluin sayth plainly that *Christ is our Redemer and is not to mount vp into his tribunal seate for the condemnation of a faithful man.* Adde to this that place of Scripture *vvhosoeuer*

l. 2. Inst. c. 16. 18.

Io. 3.

beleueth not is already iudged. And thou shalt see that Caluin leaueth none for Christ to condemne, at the latter day. And truly herin Caluin speaketh very conformably to his owne doctrin. For he is of opinion that Christ hath so redemed vs that no law can bynd vs, and no sinne can be imputed vnto vs, which if it be so the title of a Redemer and a Iudge are repugnant, and so if Christ be our Redemer after this maner, he can not be our Iudge. For if our redemption importeth a release from al lawes, and such a friedom from sinne, that no sinne can be imputed vnto vs, then certes Christ can not for any sinne, condemne vs at the latter day.

See the fourth booke & fifth ch. and seuenth booke chap 4.

No faithful man can be cõdened by their opinion.

6. Secondly they deny al merit, and affirme that al our actions are of them selues mortal sinnes, seme they neuer so good: which is the opinion both of Luther and Caluin, and is commonly receiued of al their scholars: by vvhich doctrin they take away the sentence of remuneration. For if our actions deserue nothing at God his hands, then although he may frankely bestovv vpon his elect, vvhat glorie it pleaseth him, yet can he not be sayd to remunerate and reward their vvorks: for where is no desert, there is no reward, and so though Christ may like a liberal King bestow glorie on them, yet he can not like a Iudge by sentence of remuneration reward them: and so Christ loseth an other part of his office.

Li. 2. Inst. c. 8. 9. Inst. 6. 5. 7 Lut. de capt. Bab. c. de bap. & in cap. 2. ad Gal.

No sentẽce of remuneration by their doctrin.

7. They affirme also that al our sinnes are æqual, and they scoffe at the distinction of mortal and venial sinnes: and in this also Caluin speaketh according to his grounds: for he sayth, that al our actions are vicious, because they procede from a vicious nature corrupted by original sinne, vvhence foloweth, that al our actions are alike defiled, because they procede from the same fountaine of corruption. Which doctrin if it go for true, then doth Christ lose the third part of his office, which is discussion of sinnes and causes. For where there is no distinction betwixt the crimes and offences, there can be no difference in punishement, and vvhere no difference is in punishment, the Iudge must pronounce the same sentence & giue the same iudgement, without al discussion either of the offences or the punishmentes.

Lut. Calu sup. Mel in locis vt de discrim pec. mor. & ven.

No discussion of causes by their doctrin.

8. They auouch also that vve haue no libertie nor frie vvil in our actions, whence it foloweth (as I shal demonstrate in the seuenth booke) that in our actions is neither vertue nor vice, neither meritie nor demerit, and so Christ in his iudgement can exercise none of al the three offices which are before mentioned. For where is no vertue, nor merit, there can be no sentence of remuneration and reward:

See the seuẽth booke c. 7. chap. 10.

vvard:

ward: where is no vice there can be no sentence of condemnation, & where is no vertue nor vice at al, there can be no difference of workes, either in vertue, or vice, merit, or demerit, and where is no difference of causes, there can be no discussion, as is already proued. And so Christ should be no Iudge at al. For as S. Austin sayth. *If frievvil be not, hovv can God iudge the vvorld?* And if we haue not frie wil, why are not brute beastes called to iudgement as wel as we, seing that nothing can excuse their cruelties but want of frie wil? *Epist. 46. No reason by their doctrin vvhy brut beastes are not rained and Iudged.*

9. Lastly they are not afrayd to auerre, that God and consequently Christ, is the author of al our sinnes, that Iudas his treachery and Dauids adulterie were as much God his vvorke, as S. Paules conuersion, yea Caluin sayth, that God vrgeth vs, eggeth, & enforceth vs to sinne: vvhich doctrin if it go for currant, Christ can not iustly condemne any, because as Fulgentius sayth: *Deus non est autor eius cuius est Vltor: God is not the autor of that of vvhich he is the reuenger, and punisher.* And consequently can not iustly punish sinners, if he be author of their sinnes. For vvith good reason might the condemned persons make exception against his sentence, and stand to it, that by no reason nor iustice God can condemne them for that, in vvhich he had as much part as they, and to vvhich he inforced them. And so thou seest (gentle reader) how these great bosters who bragge they giue al to Christ, despoile him and robbe him of his honourable title of *Iudge of the quicke and the deade*, which they professe in their Creed, but deny in their doctrin. *See the fifth booke & first chap. l ad Monimũ VVhat the dãned may say for thẽ selues out of the nevv doctrin. The cõclusion.*

The eight Chapter declareth hovv to no smal iniurie of Christ they make euery Christian, and faythful man, as good and as holy, as he him self is.

VTHER, Caluin, and al the packe of their adhærents, as in the seuenth booke shalbe related, and in part, in the second and third Chapter of his third booke is already declared, are of opinion that we are iustified & sanctified by the selfe same iustice, wherevvith Christ him selfe is iust, which is inherent in him, and imputed to vs, and apprehended by vs vvith the reaching hand of faith, and so made our owne. They are afrayed forsooth to *The reformers deny inherent iustice.*

grant inhærent iustice, lest they should giue vs occasion to glorie in our owne sanctitie, and so to fal into Pelagianisme, which affirmeth that Christes grace is not necessary. But whilest they feare where they needed not, they feare not where they should, but runne boldly, and desperatly into absurd blasphemie. For Pelagius is not condemned for auouching inherent grace, but for denying that Christs grace was necessarie, either to the obseruing of the law, or to the meriting of eternal glorie, or to the ouercoming of tentations, or auoiding of sinne: and for affirming that man by his owne frie wil without grace might do al these thinges Wherfore to grant inherent grace, by which we are iustified and sanctified, hath no resemblance with Pelagianisme: neither doth it giue vs occasion of pride, for thongh this grace be in our soules, yet is it the guift of God, and an effect of Christs Passion, and so is his, by guift and merit, because he giueth it, and deserued it for vs, & it is ours only by donation, and possession.

Ex Aug hær. 22. ep. 95 205. 206 l. de nat. & grat. c. 10. & 18.

Pelagius opinion.

To grant inherēt iustice is no Pelagianisme.

To what absurdities Imputatiue iustice driueth our aduersaries.

2. But whilest they seeke to auoid Charibdis they fal into Scylla: for if we haue no created inhærent iustice, but are iust only by Christs iustice imputed to vs, then doth it folow, that so soone as we apprehend Christs iustice as our owne, we are at the very first come to a ful point in perfection, and so perfect that vve can proced no farther, because Christs grace is so perfect that it neuer increased: for as the first Adam, was created in perfect growth & stature, so the second Adam was indevved from the first moment of his conception, with perfect sanctifie, and was euen then at his ful pitch, and spiritual growth neuer increasing either in grace or knowledge, but only in body, yeares, and experience. And so if we be iust by his grace imputed to vs, then are we so perfect that as the Beguines & Beguards sayd, we can be no perfecter, and so are al iust alike, and consequently shal al receiue the same glorie as Iouinian the heretike sayed, and shal not differ in glorie as starres do in brightnes, as S. Paul auoucheth.

The first that vve are perfect the first moment. that vve are al iust alike.

Christ neuer increased in sanctitie.

1. Cor. 15.

The second that vve are as iust as Christ.

3. Secondly hence it foloweth that we are al as iust as Christ. For if we be iust by his iustice, then is his iustice and ours al one, and so we as iust as he. They wil say, that his iustice in him is inhærent, to vs only it is imputed, & is only so much ours, as we apprehend it by faith, and therfore we and he may be iust by one and the same iustice, and yet not iust alike. But this wil not serue their turne: for although this may make some difference in the maner of iustification, yet in iustice and sanctitie it selfe, we are as iust as Christ: because we are iust by his iustice which faith apprehendeth: and seing that faith apprehendeth al Chri-

Their answver

The refutatiō.

al Christes iustice, al is imputed to vs, and so we are as iust as Christ, or at least reputed as iust as he.

4. Let no man then meruaile at Martin Luther, for auouching once in the heat of his sermon, that euery Christian is as holy as our blessed Lady, neither let him think that Bucers mouth ran ouer, when he sayd that the vilest of the ministerie or faithful is better thē S Iohn Baptist: no, he must not be scandalized at those bold speaches of some, who as D. Tapper relateth, were not afrayd, nor ashamed to bost that they were as grateful to God as Christ him selfe is. For if we be iust by Christs iustice (which by faith on our part is vvholy of vs apprehended, and wholy by God imputed vnto vs) we either are, or at least are reputed, as iust as he, and consequently are as grateful and acceptable to God as he. O Luceferian pride, ô sacrilege worthy reuenge from heauen. For what is this but to make them selues felovvmates vvith Christ, and consequently to make them selues gods, or him a creature? By Luthers and Caluins leaue, the creature novv may compare vvith the creator, and the redemed with the Redemer, and may boldly say not only as Lucifer did, that he wilbe like the higheſt, but may adde to his pride and aspire higher then he, affirming boldly that he is already as iust, as holy, and as good as Christ, who is the higheſt And thus the reader may see how true it is that these men giue al to Christ, who giue so much to them selues, that they wil be as good as he.

Ser in Nat. Virg. Luther sayd al are as good as our B. Lady.

cap. 3 in Mat. Bucer that a minister is as good as S. Io. Baptist.

In explic. ar. de iustif. The reformers are so many Lucifers.

The Conclusion.

The ninth Chapter, shevveth hovv they make Christ ignorant, not knovving vvhat belonged to his office, and hovv therby they bring the nevv testament, and Christian Religion in question.

AS the first man Adam, in the first moment of his life, was created not a babe, infant, or weakling, but a strong and lustie man, as if he had bene at fortie or fiftie yeares of age, (for then men at that age were most youthful and lustie) so vvas he indewed with al science and knowlge belonging to his state. For if God gaue him from the beginning, a perfect stature and pitch, & an able body fitte for generation, because he was to be the common father, by whom

Adam the first day vvas a man perfect. l. 4. in p. 1. q. 1.

Adam; Knowledge Plato in Grasilo. Perer. l 5 in Gen q 1.3.4 Molina 1 p in trac de opere Sex dierum.

vvhom mankind ſhould he propagated, no doubt he gaue him alſo a ſoule furniſhed with al natural ſciences, becauſe he was the firſt Doctor, to whom mankind was to goe to ſchoole, to learne of him as of a Maſter the ſecrets of nature, the inuentions of artes, the knowledge of God, & the Myſteries of fayth Neither is this collection myn only, but is the common opinion of Diuines, which Eccleſiaſticus confirmeth, who no litle extolleth the firſt Adams knowledge. If therfore the firſt Adam was ſo vviſe and ſo rich in knowledge, what ſhal we ſay of the ſecond Adams knowledge, who vvas the high Prieſt, and Doctor of the newv Lavv, and vvas to reueale greater ſecretes and Myſteries to his Church, then the firſt Adam ſhould haue manifeſted vnto his poſteritie?

The ſecond Adam Chriſt Ieſus, vviſer.

3. Reg 3. 4. Eccleſiaſt. 1. Salomons VViſedom.

2. Salomon alſo is famous for his profound wiſedom, in ſo much that holy Scripture giueth him this preeminence, that *he vvas vviſer then al that vvent before him, or came after him, and excelled al that euer vvere in Hierusalem, and vvas more learned then al the Eaſterne Sages.* In ſo much that not only the Queene of Saba, but others alſo from al parts of the world reſorted vnto him, to heare him diſcourſe vpon the natures of beaſts, trees, and plantes, euen from the Cedar, to the Iſope. If Salomon, King of the Iewes only, who built but a material Temple for God, was indewed with ſo rare knowledge, vvhat ſhal we thinke of the ſecond Salomons wiſdom, Chriſt Ieſus, who vvas as a ſpiritual King to rule the whole world, and was to builde a Temple and Church for God to dwel in, no leſſe then the Chriſtian world, which was and is farre more glorious then that of Salomons building, for *the glorie of the laſt Temple, vvas greater then that of the firſt?* And behold ſayth Chriſt pointing to him ſelfe, *more then Salomon here.*

3. Reg 4. 10. Mat. 12.

The ſecond Salomon Chriſt Ieſus, vviſer then the firſt.

Agg 2. Mat. 12.

Chriſts Knovvledge. S. Tho. 3 p q. 9 & 10 Caiet Zuarez. Bart. Medina Ibidem ſcholaſticis in 3. d. 14.

3. Wherfore Diuines with one common conſent affirme, that our Sauiour Chriſt was enriched with the euident and cleare viſion of God, by which euen as man he ſawe God face to face, and al his diuine attributes, and perfections. Secondly they ſay, he was endewed with al natural ſciences, which are perfections and ornamentes of mans ſoule. Thirdly they ſay, that he had a ſupernatural and infuſed ſcience, by which he ſaw clearly the Myſteries of Chriſtian fayth, vvhich we beleue, by vvhich he foreſaw al future thinges, euen the day of Iudgement, and penetrated to the harts of men, that he knew euery mās cogitation. And this the Prophet Eſaie inſinuareth, when he ſayth *that the ſpirit of vviſdome and vnderſtanding ſhal reſt vpon him.* To which S. Paul ſubſcribeth when he calleth Chriſt the *treaſure houſe of Gods vviſdom.*

Iſa 11. Col. 2.

And

And this knowledge Christ obteyned not by studie and labour, but by infusion euen from the first moment of his conception: and therfore vvhen he was but twelue yeares old, and had neuer bene trayned vp in Schoole or Vniuersitie, he disputed so learnedly with the Doctors, that they were al astonished at his vvisdome. And no meruayle for he was the vvisdome of his Father, and the word of God, and his humaine nature was the booke in vvhich Gods vvord, vvas as it vvere written, by Incarnation, with an abbreuiation, and so must nedes be the treasure howse of Gods vvisdome, and as it were the Academie of al sciences. This is the opinion which Catholiques haue of their High Priest, chiefe Doctor, and Maister, Christ Iesus.

Christs knowledge vvas infused.
Luc. 2.
Io. 7.
Christ as man vvas the booke in vvhich Gods vvorde vvas vvritten, and the treasure howse of Gods knowledge.

4. But the Gospellers and nevv Christians of this age haue not so honourable an opinion of him, but rather like proud Disciples they wil correct this their Maister, and accuse him of grosse ignorance. Luther wil stand to it that Christ knew not when the day of Iudgement was to happen, yea that some tymes he was ignorant of other matters. Zuinglius, Bucer and Beza are opinion that Christ profited in knowledge by litle and litle, and knevv not yester day, what he knoweth to day. Wherin they imitate the Gnostickes, and Agnoits and the author of the booke of Christs infancie, which recordeth that Christ went to Schole and learned his A. B. C. Caluin in his iarring Harmonie vpon the Euangelists, explicating those words of S. Luke: *And the child encreased and vvas comforted in spirit.* sayth plainly, and repeateth it tvvise or thrise, that Christ profited not only in apparance but verily and inwardly, in grace and knowledge, & was ignorant also of many things, euen as other men are, sauing that ignorance in men is a paine of sinne, and a part of original sinne, in Christ it was not so. And in the same booke he sayth, that Christ as man knew not the day of Iudgement, not only because he knevv it not to tel it to others, but also because he could not informe him selfe of the same. The like song Caluin singeth in the same Harmonie hādling that place, where Christ is sayd to haue prayed to his Father to frie him from the Chalice of his Passion, if it were possible: for there Caluin often repeateth that those wordes issued out of Christes mouth ere he was aware, and that feare & griefe did so perturbate his mynd that he knew not what he sayd, and therfore corrected him selfe by and by. O arrogancie more then Luciferian: Dareth the potte accuse the potter of vvant of skil? or dareth the creature accuse the Creator of ignorance, and the Christian condemne Christ of folye, error, & inconsideration? If he be worthy

The Gospellers say that Christ vvas ignorant.
Cone. de Nat. Domini Hom Dom. 1. post Epiph.
Luthers opinio of Christs knowledge.
Iren. l. 1. c. 17.
Amb l. 1. 5. de fide c. 7.
liber: in Breu c. 19.
The Gnostikes opinion.
Isid l. 8 etym. c. 5.
Calu. in Har. Luc. 2.
Caluins opinion.

Mat. 5. hel that shal say (*foole*) to his brother, how many helles deserueth Caluin, that in effect, with the same contumelious wordes, myscalleth Christ himselfe.

Caluins obiection. 5. But say they, Christ himselfe saith, that he knew not the day of iudgement, *ergo*, he was ignorant of it. I grant he semed to say so, but his meaning is to be taken. And the ancient Fathers rather then they would say that Christ was ignorant, would seeke to interpret these wordes, so as they might not seme to derogate to him. Some therfore sayd that he knoweth not that day, because *he was ignorant of it in his members*, others say, that he ment only, that he knew it not by humain knowledge, but yet denied not but that he knew it by reuelation: others say that he sayd he knew it not, because it was committed to him in such secret, that he might not reueale it, and so knew it not, to reueale it vnto others: yea some rather then they would make Christ to be ignorant, auouched that those words were foisted in by the Arrianes, to proue Christ to be but a creature, and pure man. They obiect also that S. Luke sayth, that IESVS, *encreased in age, grace, and wisdome, before God, and men*. But this argument is as easily answered, for some expound those wordes thus: Christ encreased in age verily, and before God and men, but in grace and wisdome only in outward apparence and before men: others say, that he encreased in grace and wisdom, that is in actions of grace and wisdome, because as he came to riper yeares, so he made more remonstrance of his grace, & wisdome, by meritorious operations, & actes of wisdome, which were in dede meritorious, gracious, and wise, and were esteemed such before God and men. Although inwardly they neither augmented Christes grace, nor his wisdom: for as diuines say, at the first he was as holy and wise as at the last, because in his conception as al grace and wisdom was then new, because he was the Sonne of God, so al was then infused: and only he had greater and greater experience.

Mar. 13.
The answer.
How Christ knew not the day of Iudgement.
Amb. in 29. Luc.
Nazorat. 6
Theol.
Hier Chrys-
Theophil c.
2. Mat.
Hier in c. 2.
Mat.
Luc. 2.
An other obiection.
The answer.
S. Th. 3. p. q.
7. 4. 12.
Caiet: Suar.
medin ibidē.

an other obiection of Caluin. 6. But yet they haue not doone. Either (saith Caluin) Christ knew that it was possible to escape death, or he knewe not. If he Knew, why doubteth he? If he knewe not, then was he ignorant. Thus the diuel laboureth in his members and ministers, to make the wisdome of God ignorant. To this therfore we must also giue an answer: and that we shal as easily. For Christ knew that it was absolutely possible to auoid death and therfore sayd to his Father: *al thinges are possible to thee*: he knew also that supposing his Fathers will and commandement, he was to dye: yet thus he spake and thus he prayd, to shew him selfe

Gal. Harm. Mer. 14.
The answer.
Mar. 14.

true

true man, and to declare that according vnto the flesh he feared death, yet absolutly according to the wil of his superior part, he was resolued to die, as appeareth, by those words folowing: *but not as I wil, but as thou wilt.* As if he had sayd, as I am flesh and bloud, and according to natural affection I feare death as it is repugnant to nature, and in this respect I would faine espace it, but yet because it is thy wil (ô Father) and is expedient, yea necessary for mankind, I am most willing to dye, & therfore not my wil (that is the desire which as I am flesh and bloud is common to me with other men:) but thy wil be done, to which the wil of my superior & reasonable part is alwayes conformable. Which two willes in Christ are not contrarie, because the one feareth death as it is contrarie to nature, and the sensual part: the other imbraceth death as it is the price of mannes redemption, and the obiect of Gods wil, neither doth the latter wil correct the former, but both are right in their kind. For as death is against nature, it is to be feared, and as it is the obiect of fortitude, and the meanes of mannes redemption, it is to be imbraced, and the one sheweth Christ to be a man, the other declareth the force of grace wherewith the weakenes of humain nature is corroborated. And so Christ knew that his Fathers wil was that he should suffer, and his wil also in the reasonable part was resolued: bue yet to shew him selfe a man, according to his sensual part he sayd: *if it be possible frieme from this chalice.*

Christs vvil alvvayes resolued to dy.
The vvil of the Superior part of Christs soule, and the vvil of the inferior part not contrarie.
How death is to be feared, hovv to be desired.

7. Now if you desire a reason vvhy Christ that vndertooke our mortalitie, would none of our ignorance: diuines wil giue you one most euident. Because Christ (say they) vndertooke only those imperfections of our nature, vvhich either were necessarie to declare him selfe a man, or to make satisfaction for our sinnes, or to giue vs example: and because obedience, fasting, prayer, humilitie, pouertie, and such like serued for paternes for vs to imitate, he vvas obedient, he fasted, prayd, humiliated him selfe, and liued poorly: and because also hunger, thirst, cold, heate, mortalitie, vvere necessarie to suffer and to satisfie for vs, he vvas hungry, thirstie, hote, cold, and mortal; and lastly, because nothing more declared that he vvas a man then feare of death, vvhich manes nature abhorreth, he feared, and svvet for feare, not vvater only, but also bloud. But because sinne vvas against the end of redemption which he proposed to him selfe, he would none of that, yea he could not because he vvas the Sonne of God: and for as much as inordinate motions of the flesh serued neither for example, nor satisfaction, yea vvere rather contrarie, he also refused them: and be-

Vvhy Christ tooke not our ignorance.
Vvhat imperfections he tooke.

cause ignorance, also is many tymes ioyned with sinne, either as the cause, or effect of sinne (for whosoeuer sinneth, sayth the Philosopher is ignorant and inconsiderate) yea because this was repugnant to the office of a Messias who was to instruct the whole world in heauenly doctrin, and was not necessary to declare him selfe to be man, because feare and other imperfections serued for that purpose sufficiently, yea could not demonstrate him to be man because Angels and diuels may be ignorant: he would take no ignorance vpon him.

If Christ had be e ignorant he might haue sinned.

8. But let the heretike blaspheme a while, and let him exceede the diuil his father in blasphemy: if Christ were ignorant, he was subiect also to sinne: because he might haue followed his ignorance. For if the vnderstanding may erre or be inconsiderate, the wil which is directed by the vnderstanding may wander & swarue from reasons rule and kore, and consequently also may sinne: And so our reformed Christians wil make a deformed Christ of our Messias, who being him selfe subiect to sinne (as he is if he can be ignorant or inconsiderate) & consequently hauing neede him selfe of a redemer, wil yet take vpon him to redeeme others, and to saue others, who him selfe nedeth a Sauiour. See how basely these men conceiue of Christ, who though they say that they giue al vnto him, yet do make him an ignorant and inconsiderate man: and yet they them selues wil be so eagle-eyed that they can find out al the true meanings of Scripture with a priuate spirit, and know as wel as the begger his dish, their owne iustification and predestination.

Our Gospellers wil not be ignorant of their predestination nor of Scripture.

9. But to come nearer to our purpose, and conclusion, if Christ were ignorant and inconsiderate, then can the truth erre, wisdom can be deceiued, and the way can goe out of the way for *he was the way the truth, and the life*, and the wisdome of his Father. If Christ can be ignorant, he may be deceiued, if he may be deceiued he may deceiue, (because he may teach according to his error) if he may deceiue, paraduenture he hath deceiued and then paraduenture his preaching, his Gospel, and whatsoeuer he hath taught of Christian religion, is error, and deceipt: and so by litle, and litle, heresie leadeth to Atheisme, and this their blasphemous doctrin, ruineth Christianitie. But fye rather vpon these blasphemers, Christ is the wisdom of his Father, and so can not be deceiued, he is *prima Veritas the prime Veritie*, and so can not deceiue, & he is *summum bonum chiefest good*, yea goodnes it selfe, and so wil not deceiue, and our Gospellers are heretikes, that is deceiued, & deceiuers.

The Conclusion.

Io. 14.

To grant Christ to be ignorant, ruineth Scripture.

Heretikes deceiued and deceiuers.

The tenth chapter shevveth hovv they make Christ a desperate man, vvho not only feared the iudgement-seate of his father, but also despaired for the tyme, of his ovvne saluation.

THese Reformers haue not yet in their opinion, deformed Christ sufficiently, for not content to haue made him an ignorant man, they auouch also that he feared his Fathers tribunal, and dispaired of his ovvne saluation, & so they vvil make him also a desperate man. Caluin in his Harmonie of the Gospels sayth, that vvhen Christ vvas in his agonie in the garden, it vvas not the feare of death only vvhich made him svveat blood and vvater, but sayth he: *It vvas the terrible iudgement-seat of God, and the iudge armed vvith incomprehensible vengeance vvhich he proposed before his eyes, and on the other part our sinnes, vvhich he had taken vpon him pressed him vvith their vveight: so that it vvas no meruail if this bottomlesse pitte and horrible confusion of damnation, did so feircely torment him vvith feare, and anguish.* And a litle after: *death of it selfe could not so haue tormented the soule of the Sonne of God, had it not been that he perceiued that he had to do vvith the iudgement of God.* And again he repeateth this his blasphemie, lest you should think it escaped him vnaduisedly: *Vvhence it folovveth that he feared a greater euil then death, vvhich prouoked him to desire to be exempted from death: vvhich vvas, that proposing before his eyes the vvrath of God, in so much that he presented himselfe before his iudgemẽt seate being charged vvith the sinnes of the vvhole vvorlde, it vvas necessary that he should be affrighted & afrayed of the profound bottomles pitte of death.* And with in some fevv lynes after he sayth, that *this deadly svveat could not procede but from an vnaccustomed & horrible feare.* Yea sayth he, to think that this agonie proceded only from feare of death, *vvere to attribute vnto Christ a pusillanimitie, vvhich vve vvould condemne in an ordinarie man.*

In c. 26 Mat. 37. in fine.

Caluin saith christ feared the tribunal Seat and sentence of God yea damnation.

38.

Ibidem.

2. Here Christian Reader, do not thy eares burne to heare blasphemie so often repeated? and vvil thy Christian zeale permit such disgrace to be offered thy redeemer? vvhat Iohn Caluin, did Christ feare the tribunal seat of his Father? then feared he the Iudges sentence, lest it should be pronoũced against him, then feared he damnation and

The sequel of Caluins doctrin.

Mat. 25. doubted vvhether he ſhould be comprehended in the ſentence of *Venite benedicti, come yee bleſſed of my Father, or Ite maledicti, goe you curſed into fier euerlaſting*: then vvas he in a perplexitie and doubt, vvhether he ſhould be placed on the right hand vvith the elect, or on the left hand vvith the reprobate: And ſo the Sonne of God vvho came to ſaue others, vvas not ſure of his ovvne ſaluation. Novv therfore if I vvil ſhevv my ſelfe a Chriſtian, zealous of Chriſts honour, or careful of myn ovvne ſaluation, I muſt ſeeke to flie him from this feare of his Fathers ſentence: for if he periſh (as Caluin ſayth he feared leſt he ſhould periſh eternally) then muſt vve al periſh, becauſe by him only vve looke for ſaluation.

The ſecuritie of the iuſt at the later day.

Sap. 5.

5. The vviſeman ſayth that at the later day *the iuſt ſhal ſtand in great conſtancie*, euen then vvhen the ſentence ſhalbe pronoũced, much greater no doubt ſhal be the conſtancie of Chriſt Ieſus, the Sonne of God, of vvhom al the Saincts that vvere, haue borovved their fortitude and courage. For he being the natural Sonne of God, knevv ful vvel, that his Father neither vvould, nor could deny his Sonne, and vvas aſſured that he vvho vvas to ſitte in iudgement, and to pronounce the ſentence, could not be him ſelfe arraigned. And is it likely that God vvho indevved Chriſts humaine nature vvith al knovvledge, and reuealed to him al ſecrets, euen harts cogitations, and the day of dome, which the Angels know not: vvould kepe this only ſecret from him, and would not let him know vvhat ſhould become of him ſelfe at the day of his death? The Diuines with one conſent are of opinion, that Chriſts ſoule from his conception, receiued the bliſſe & glorye, vvhich at the day of our particular iudgement, or at our deliuery out of Purgatorie, our ſoules ſhal receiue: and they ſay that to a glorified ſoule, is dew a glorified body, becauſe the glory of the ſoule naturally impparteth it ſelfe vnto the body, & that in Chriſt, it vvas no miracle, that his body was ſo glorious in his transfiguration, but rather it was a miracle that his glorious ſoule did not make his body alſo partaker of that glory from the beginning: but yet this miracle Chriſt vſed that he might ſuffer hunger, thirſt, cold, and other miſeries, vvhich he could not haue done in a glorified body. How then was it poſſible that Chriſt ſhould feare his Fathers tribunal, and terrible ſentence, vvho vvas already in poſſeſſion of the glory of his ſoule, and aſſured that his glorious ſoule, ſhould haue at the length, that is after his Paſſion, a glorified body.

Chriſt vvas bleſſed from the beginning.

a glorious body is dew to a glorious ſoule.

The trãſfiguration vvas no miracle.

Vvhy Chriſt vvould not in this life let his body be partaker of this ſoules glory.

Caluins obiection.

4. But ſayth Caluine: Chriſt had taken vpon him our ſinnes, and therfore

therfore might very wel feare to appeare before his Fathers iudgemẽt seate. This is his diuinitie or rather blasphemie. For if he meane that Christ hath so vndertaken our sinnes, that he verily made them his owne, what more blasphemie could he vtter? For although Illiricus auouched that God the Father so porẽtly imputed our sinnes to Christ that he made him a sinner, yet Christian tongues abhorre to vtter, and Christian eares do burne to heare such blasphemous speaches. For S. Peter, who sayth that Christ *bare our sinnes*, addeth withal, that *he bare them in his body vpon the wood*, to signifie that he tooke not the malice of our sinnes vpon him, (for then he should haue sayd that he bare our sinnes in his soule, because the soule only is the subiect of sinne) but that he suffered the paines dew vnto our sinnes, when he suffered the death of body, vpon the crosse. Yea as when one satisfieth for an others offence, he taketh not the offence vpon him, but is content to abide the punishment, to set his freind at libertie: so Christ our Mediator and Redemer, is sayd to haue taken our sinnes vpon him and to haue satisfied for them, because he hath endured the paynes which were dew vnto them: but as for our sinnes, he was not capable of them, and therfore the same S. Peter in the same place sayth, that Christ *neuer sinned, & that guile or fraude was neuer found in his mouth.* Wherfore though Christ might feare death, & the torments of the crosse, because those he was to suffer for vs, yet had he no cause to feare hel & damnation, because although that punishment was dew vnto our sinnes, yet was not Christ to suffer it, becakse his passion was sufficient, as in the next chapter shal be proued. And this I hope wil suffice a reasonable man.

The answer.

Illyricus sayd that christ by taking our sinnes on him was a very sinner.

1. Pet 2.

Christ vndertooke the paine dew to sinne but not the sinne.

an example.

Christ feared death but not hel nor damnation.

5. But Iohn Caluin stil caileth and will not be satisfied with reason. For sayth he, Christ had bene very effeminate, if for feare of death only he had swette bloud and water, therfore it was no lesse then hel and damnation, whose feare cast him into such an extraordinarie sweate. See what care Caluin hath lest Christ should be counted a coward: and yet, whilest to find out a sufficient cause of such a feare, he sayth that he was afrayed of iudgement: he maketh him to feare that which he was sure should neuer happen, which is the greatest folly in the world, and argueth the most effeminate, and cowardly hart that can be. I answer therfore that the feare of death only, was sufficient to make him sweate water and bloud: For if, as Aristotle sayth, abundance of bloud, and distemperature of body, be sufficient to make men sometymes to sweate bloud, wel may we conceiue how

in cap 2. Luc. 4.

Caluin maketh Christ a Coward.

The answer. l. 3. hist animalium c. 19.

distemperature may make a man sweat bloud

feare

Mat. 25. doubted vvhether he ſhould be comprehended in the ſentence of *Venite benedicti, come yee bleſſed of my Father, or Ite maledicti, goe you curſed into fier euerlaſting*: then vvas he in a perplexitie and doubt, vvhether he ſhould be placed on the right hand vvith the elect, or on the left hand vvith the reprobate: And ſo the Sonne of God vvho came to ſaue others, vvas not ſure of his ovvne ſaluation. Novv therfore if I vvil ſhevv my ſelfe a Chriſtian, zealous of Chriſts honour, or careful of myn ovvne ſaluation, I muſt ſeeke to flie him from this feare of his Fathers ſentence: for if he periſh (as Caluin ſayth he feared leſt he ſhould periſh eternally) then muſt vve al periſh, becauſe by him only vve looke for ſaluation.

The ſecuritie of the iuſt at the later day.

Sap. 5.

3. The vviſeman ſayth that at the later day *the iuſt ſhal ſtand in great conſtancie*, euen then vvhen the ſentence ſhalbe pronoũced, much greater no doubt ſhal be the conſtancie of Chriſt Ieſus, the Sonne of God, of vvhom al the Saincts that vvere, haue borovved their fortitude and courage. For he being the natural Sonne of God, knevv ful vvel, that his Father neither vvould, nor could deny his Sonne, and vvas aſſured that he vvho vvas to ſitte in iudgement, and to pronounce the ſentence, could not be him ſelfe arraigned. And is it likely that God vvho indevved Chriſts humaine nature vvith al knovvledge, and reuealed to him al ſecrets, euen harts cogitations, and the day of deme, which the Angels know not: vvould kepe this only ſecret from him, and would not let him know vvhat ſhould become of him ſelfe at the day of his death? The Diuines with one conſent are of opinion, that Chriſts ſoule from his conception, receiued the bliſſe & glorye, vvhich at the day of our particular iudgement, or at our deliuery out of Purgatorie, our ſoules ſhal receiue: and they ſay that to a glorified ſoule, is dew a glorified body, becauſe the glory of the ſoule naturally impar-teth it ſelfe vnto the body, & that in Chriſt, it vvas no miracle, that his body was ſo glorious in his transfiguration, but rather it was a miracle that his glorious ſoule did not make his body alſo partaker of that glory from the beginning: but yet this miracle Chriſt vſed that he might ſuffer hunger, thirſt, cold, and other miſeries, vvhich he could not haue done in a glorified body. How then was it poſſible that Chriſt ſhould feare his Fathers tribunal, and terrible ſentence, vvho vvas already in poſſeſſion of the glory of his ſoule, and aſſured that his glorious ſoule, ſhould haue at the length, that is after his Paſſion, a glorified body.

Chriſt could not feare the later day.

Chriſt vvas bleſſed from the beginning.

a glorious body is dew to a glorious ſoule.

The trãſfiguration vvas no miracle.

Vvhy Chriſt vvould not in this life let his body be partaker of this ſoules glory.

Caluins obiection.

4. But ſayth Caluine: Chriſt had taken vpon him our ſinnes, and therfore

therfore might very wel feare to appeare before his Fathers iudgemẽt-seate. This is his diuinitie or rather blasphemie. For if he meane that Christ hath so vndertaken our sinnes, that he verily made them his owne, what more blasphemie could he vtter? For although Illiricus auouched that God the Father so plainly imputed our sinnes to Christ that he made him a sinner, yet Christian tongues abhorre to vtter, and Christian eares do burne to heare such blasphemous speaches. For S. Peter, who sayth that Christ *bare our sinnes*, addeth withal, that *he bare them in his body vpon the wood*, to signifie that he tooke not the malice of our sinnes vpon him (for then he should haue sayd that he bare our sinnes in his soule, because the soule only is the subiect of sinne) but that he suffered the paines dew vnto our sinnes, when he suffered the death of body, vpon the crosse. Yea as when one satisfieth for an others offence, he taketh not the offence vpon him, but is content to abide the punishment, to set his freind at libertie: so Christ our Mediator and Redemer, is sayd to haue taken our sinnes vpon him and to haue satisfied for them, because he hath endured the paynes which were dew vnto them: but as for our sinnes, he was not capable of them, and therfore the same S. Peter in the same place sayth, that Christ *neuer sinned, & that guile or fraude was neuer found in his mouth.* Wherfore though Christ might feare death, & the torments of the crosse, because those he was to suffer for vs, yet had he no cause to feare hel & damnation, because although that punishment was dew vnto our sinnes, yet was not Christ to suffer it, because his passion was sufficient, as in the next chapter shal be proued. And this I hope wil suffice a reasonable man.

The answer.

Illyricus sayd that christ by taking our sinnes on him was a very sinner.

1. Pet 2.

Christ vndertooke the paine dew to sinne but not the sinne.

an example.

5. But Iohn Caluin stil cauileth and will not be satisfied with reason. For sayth he, Christ had bene very effeminate, if for feare of death only he had swette bloud and water, therfore it was no lesse then hel and damnation, whose feare cast him into such an extraordinarie sweate. See what care Caluin hath lest Christ should be counted a coward: and yet, whilest to find out a sufficient cause of such a feare, he sayth that he was afrayed of iudgement: he maketh him to feare that which he was sure should neuer happen, which is the greatest folly in the world, and argueth the most effeminate, and cowardly hart that can be. I answer therfore that the feare of death only, was sufficient to make him sweate water and bloud: For if, as Aristotle sayth, abundance of bloud, and distemperature of body, be sufficient to make men sometymes to sweate bloud, wel may we conceiue how

Christ feared death but not hel nor damnation.

in cap 2. Luc. 4.

Caluin maketh Christ a Coward.

The answer. l. 3. hist animalium c. 19.

distemperature may make a man sweat bloud

feare

Hovv the feare of death only might make Christ ſvveat bloud.

feare of death in Chriſt (vvhich muſt needs be very great, partly becauſe he would haue it ſo for our ſakes, and partly becauſe he would not impart any comforte, or ſtrength, vnto his humaine nature) might cauſe a diſtemperature in his body, that it being already extenuat, and emptied of other humours, might ſweat blood and water: neither proceded this from any impotencie of mynd: for he that giueth ſuch courage to his Sainctes, could haue taken the ſame him ſelfe, but he vvould permit death, and ſuch a death to do al, that ſuch an obiect could do, and he would not giue any ayde vnto the inferior part of his ſoule, vvhere this paſſion of feare afflicted him, that he might beginne in the garden the doleful tragedie of his Paſſion, vvhich he ſul, acted afterwards vpon the ſtage of his Croſſe.

Caluin addeth, that Chriſt deſpaired alſo in the garden.

6. But Caluin hath not yet caſt al his poiſon: he ſayth that Chriſt not only feared iudgement and damnation, but diſpared alſo of his Saluation. Theſe are his vvords vvhich with the other before, I tranſlated out of his french Harmonie: *But this ſemeth abſurd, that a voice of deſperation ſhould eſcape Chriſt. The anſvver is eaſie: that although the fleſh apprehended damnation, yet fayth remained firme in his hart.* Where you muſt note that Caluin hauing diſcourſed vpon thoſe vvords *my God my God vvhy haſt thou forſaken me:* he ſayth, that this vvas the greateſt agonie that Chriſt euer ſuffered, and the reaſon ſayth he was, *becauſe he vvas conuented before his fathers tribunal as culpable, and as one that had God his enemie, and as a man al ready condemned, vvhere vvith he vvas ſo ſcarred and affrighted, that it had bene enough to haue ſvvallovved vp al other men an hundred tymes. So that complaining that he vvas abandoned of his Father, he ſpeaketh not of faintnes nor in ieſt, for* (ſayth he) *the vehemencie of the griefe vvreſted out of him this complaint: for as he vvas preſented as a pledge for vs, ſo vvould he ſuſteine verily the Iudgement of God in our name.* And becauſe in theſe ſpeches he ſemed to auouch that Chriſt deſpared as one forlorne and forſaken of his Father, he ſayth that yet his fayth remained firme.

in c. 27. Mat. 11. 46.

Blaſphemie of Caluin.

Chriſt could not deſpair, neither deliberatly nor indeliberately.

Deſpaire is one of the greateſt ſinnes.

7. Is it ſo Caluin and did Chriſt as he vvas man ſo feare the iudgment-ſeatte, that he deſpaired? Then either that deſpaire vvas deliberate, or ſodaine and indeliberate. If deliberate then certes did Chriſt ſinne moſt damnably: for vvhat greater ſinne is there then to deſpare of Gods mercie? For he that deſpareth, either he thinketh not God able to ſaue him, or not vvilling, in the one he doth iniurie to Gods omnipotencie, in the other he miſpriſeth his mercie. If indeliberate, then vvas Chriſt inconſiderate, and caryed away with Paſſion like a beaſt or vnreaſonable man, vvhich although Caluin ſticketh not to

grant

grant (for he sayth that the vehemencie of his agonie wrested out of him feare and despare ere he was aware) yet do al the Fathers and Diuines in this point stand against him, affirming that neuer any Passion in Christ preuented reason and consideration. Yea they conceiue of Christ as of one that was so vigilant ouer his passions, that neuer any arose without consideration, & commandement. For when he would shew zeale he commanded a Passion of anger to arise, yet in that moderation, as it might shew him to be zealous, and yet neither testie nor furious. Likewise when it pleased him to afflict his hart with feare and sorow, he commanded those passions to arise in that vehemencie, which were expedient for him to suffer for vs, or to shew him selfe a man: and yet with that moderation, that they neuer exceded the golden meane of vertue: and he that could command the windes and tempests to cease, could command his passions downe againe. And so when in the garden he feared death, that feare was præuented, and commanded by reason, and so was deliberate, and no sinne at al, because it is natural to feare death, and if withal the superior part of the mynd be resolute, and wil not for that feare transgres Gods law or offend conscience, it increaseth the merit of martyrdome, or sufferance of death, because it augmenteth the difficulty. Wherfore Diuines cal Christs passions, *propassions*, because he alwayes præuented them, and commanded them to arise, and therfore the Euangelist sayth not, that Christ was perturbed or troubled with his passions (as we are) but that *he troubled him selfe*. In like maner when Christ cryed *on the crosse: my God my God Why hast thou forsaken me?* that complaint proceded from the sensual part of his soule which feared death, and the panges therof, and was not a complaint indeliberately wrested out by vehemencie of grief, as Caluin auoucheth, but was deliberate, and yet no sinne, because if the superior part be resolute, it is no sinne though the inferior part feare death as contrarie to nature. Neither was that complaint a desperation of saluation, for Christ (as before is declared) was sure of that, but it was a complaint of the sensual part which complained that it receiued no succour from the Diuinitie, but was left as it were to it selfe to suffer feare, grief, and paine for our Redemption, and yet in that complaint (as I sayd) was no sinne, because death is a thing to be feared, and the flesh and sensual part naturally feareth it, and this feare then is a sinne, when it maketh vs only trãsgres the law of God, which effect it could not haue in Christ, because the superior part of his soule was alwayes resolued to dye for mans redemption.

No indeliberate passions in Christ. Scholastici 3. p. q. 15.

Christ commanded his passions.

Christs passions are propassions.

Anſm. tract 19. in 10.

To feare death is no sinne if the superiour part be resolute.

When feare is a sinne.

Christ lost faith according to Caluī

8. Now wheras Caluin sayth that Christ despaired yet retained faith, I can not see howv those tvvo things can stand together in his opinion. For if fayth be an assurance of present and future iustice, yea of election and saluation (as Caluin sayth it is) then if Christ despayred of saluation, he lost his fayth, because he lost that assurance, and so by Caluins doctrin, vvas an infidel. Neither vvil Caluins shift be sufficient to hold these tvvo (tovvit assurance and desperation) together: for to say, as he sayth, that this desperation in Christ was indeliberate, and so might stand with fayth, is to vphold one absurditie by an other, for it is most absurde to ascribe vnto Christ any inconsiderate, or indeliberate actions: better vvere it for Caluin to say as Diuines commonly say, that there vvas no fayth in Christ, because fayth, vvhich is an obscure knovvledge, can not stand with the cleare vision of God vvhich Christ had, and vvhich gaue him a greater assurance of saluation, then faith can do.

See the seuēth booke & 3. c.

In Christ vvas not faith but cleare vision.

9. Thus thou seest (gentle reader) how vnlikely it is, vvhich Caluin sayth, that Christ doubted and despaired of saluation, vvho as the Sonne of God, blessed in soule from the first moment of his conception, and so assured of the blisse and glorie, both of soule and body. But because Caluin wil haue it so, let himstil stand to it, that Christ vvas arraigned as guiltie at his Fathers tribunal, and that he so feared the Iudges sentence, that he doubted yea despaired of saluation. But vvhat shal he gaine by this doctrin? he shal declare him selfe to be as he is, a sacrilegious companion, vvho robbeth Christ of his glorie, in vttering such iniurious and opprobrious speaches, and deserueth to be thrust out of the Church and schoole of Christ, for preaching that doctrin from vvhich Christian eares abhorre, and demonstrateth him selfe not to be a Christian, who speaketh so contemptibly of Christ, whom he professeth to honour, and to whom, he sayth (but how truly who seeth not?) that he giueth al homage and glorie.

The conclusiō that Caluin is a sacrilegious companion.

The de-

The eleuenth Chapter shevveth hovv Caluin bringeth Christ to Hel, and the torments therof, and so maketh him a companion of the damned.

THE sinner when he is once habituated in sinne maketh no scruple of sinne, and when he is plunged in the depth of sinne, he contemneth, and is so farre from seeking meanes to get out of this filthy sinke, that hauing once foyled him selfe, he careth not to vvallow him selfe in filth, and to adde filthines to filthines, and abomination to abomination, without stoppe or stay, ende or measure. So it happeneth to Iohn Caluin, vvho hauing begunne to blaspheme, neuer leaueth blaspheming, but addeth blasphemie to blasphemie, and stil redubleth his blasphemies. For not content to haue despoiled Christ of many noble titles, not thinking it a sufficient disgrace to make him an ignorant and desperate man, he now openeth his mouth to vtter his greatest blasphemie, and to spitte his greatest spite against him, associating him in punishement vvith the diuels, making him a member of the damned crew, and an inhabitant of hel it selfe, and from desperation bringeth him to hel and damnation.

The propertie of a sinner nusled in sinne.

Caluin bringeth Christ to hel

l. 2. c. 16.

2. In his Institutions vvhich T.N. translated into English and Richard Harison imprinted, in the yeare of our Lord 1562. hauing occasion to treate of the descēsion of Christ into hel, he saith that Christ is sayed to haue descended into hel, not that his soule locally descended (for Caluin acknowledgeth no local Hel) but because in soule he felt the paines of hel: for (sayth he) *not only the body of Christ vvas giuen to be the price of our redemption, but there vvas an other greater and more excellent price payed in this, that in his soule he suffered the terrible tormentes of a damned and forsaken man.* And a litle after, he answvereth a question which he supposeth may be moued in this maner: *Novv if a man should aske of me vvhether that Christ vvent dovvne to hel, vvhen he prayed to escape that death? I answvere, that then vvas the beginning of it.* And seing that Caluin acknovvledgeth no other hel then the paines of hel, that is, torments of mynd, wherovvith the damned are vexed; it foloweth that Christ in the garden, when

Caluin saith Christ suffered hel paines in his soule. Sect 12.

Caluī denieth local hel.

den, when he feared not only death, as Caluin sayth, but his Fathers tribunal also, began his hel, and when he despaired (as he sayth) on the crosse, he enter into the depth of hel, and so those vvords: *my God, my God vvhy hast thou forsaken me?* VVere the vvords of a damned man. O blasphemie, and that of one vvho vvil nedes be counted a zealous, and a reformed, and reforming Christian. Thou a Christian Caluin? thou a Iew and more blasphemous then a diuel. Thinkest thou that Christ vvho redemed vs, could not saue him selfe? If he suffred hel he was damned, because none suffer hel but by sentēce of damnation, and seing that out of hel there is no redemption, he is stil damned and so no redeemer.

Mat. 27.
Caluins blasphemie.

Christ according to Caluī vvas damned

3. But to reduble the iniurie vvith a floute, Caluin vvil nedes seme Christs greatest freind in preferring him to hel, for (sayth he) it had bene but a smal matter to haue suffered death of body, yea that death (sayth he) vvould only haue redemed our bodyes, but not our soules: and so to make Christ a cpmplete redemer of bodyes and soules, he bringeth him to hel. Secondly he sayth that this highly commendeth Christs mercie and charitie. And thirdly he sayth, that this also shevved the povver of Christ, vvho not only by death ouercame death but by suffring hel paines ouercame hel also, and by taking the paine vvhich vve deserued, acquitted vs of the same. Thus he shroudeth his impietie and blasphemie vnder the shew of Christs honour, & vvhen he blasphemeth most of al, he vvil seme to honour Christ vvith the title of a complete redeemer, and to commend his charitie, and povver.

Sect 12.
Caluin vvil seeme Christs freind in preferring him to hel.

4. But to the first I answer that Christ by his death and passion payed a sufficient price and ransome both for soule and body, and therfore S. Paul saith *that in Christ vve haue redemption in his bloud.* And again he sayth that Christ hath *pacified al by the bloud of the crosse both in heauen and earth.* To vvhom S. Peter subscribing, auoucheth *that vve are redemed not vvith gold nor siluer, but vvith the precious bloud of the immaculate lambe.* And neuer shal Iohn Caluin find either Scripture, or Father, that sayth, Christ suffred the paynes of hel for our redemption, but rather he shal find that they attribute our redemption to the passion and panges of death of Christs body. And therfore if Caluin wil stād to it, that Christs passion was only able to ransome our bodyes, but not our soule, he detracteth from the dignitie of Christs death, and seing that the Scriptures and Fathers acknowledge no other price to haue bene offred for vs then Christs death and passion, if that were deficient, then accor-

Eph. 5.
Col. 1.
1. Pet. 1.
Christs Passiō redeemed soule & body

Christ according to Caluī is no complet Redemer.

ding to

ding to Caluin, Christ is no complete Redeemer.

5. But he presseth vs with an argument vvhich he counteth insoluble, for (sayth he) he that satisfieth for an other must pay the debt vvhich the other oweth, and sustaine the payne, vvhich he deserued, and therfore because we deserued the paines of hel, and were to suffer them both in soule and body, it was necessarie that Christ in soule should suffer the paynes of hel, else had he bene but halfe a redemer. But by this argument Christ should haue endured in hel perpetual tormentes, and so should neuer haue redemed vs, because he should him selfe haue bene a perpetual prisoner. For if Christ must nedes suffer the selfe same paine which we deserued, thé must he according to Caluins rule haue endured a perpetual hel, because that vvas the punishement prepared for vs, and seing that eternal punishement neuer cometh to an end, Christ should neuer haue payed the rãsome dew for sinne, & so we should neuer haue bene redemed. Wherfore I say, that Christs Passion to the sufferance of which, both Christs body and soule cõcurred (for the body by it selfe alone can not suffer paine) vvas a sufficient ransome to redeme both our soules and bodyes from hel and damnation, and therfore to that only, and not to the paynes of hel, the Scriptures and Fathers do attribute our redemption. And this (as I haue proued already) was a most sufficient price, and so sufficient, that in that it was the Passion and death of him, that vvas God and man, it was sufficient to haue redemed a thousand vvorldes, yea the diueles and al the damned. Neither must Caluin be so rigorous as to thinke, that no satisfaction can be sufficient, vnles it be of the same kind with the debt, vvhich is to be payed, or the harme vvhich is to be repaired: for if one of Caluis brotherhood, had cut of the arme of an other brother, would not a peece of mony haue made satisfactiõ for the mayme? or would Caluin haue exacted arme for arme? And if one had owght Caluin an hundred crownes, would not he haue bene content to haue taken the worth or more then worth in corne, shepe, or such like but nedes must haue crowne for crowne, as though there were no other law but *lex talionis*? or if satisfaction for these debtes and losses may be made by other paymentes vvhich are of æqual valew, then might Christ by suffering death, which was of infinite price and valew make a ful satisfaction for the paines of hel: and yet neuer feele the paines therof.

Supra. Calvins obiection.

An absurditie vvhich followeth his argument.

The answer.

See the third booke and 3. c.

It vvas not cõuenient that Christ should suffer hel paines.

6 And in dede it vvas not conuenient that Christ should suffer the paines of hel. For first those paines are of their nature perpetual:

The first reason.

and so if Christ had once permitted those torments to afflict his soule, he should neuer haue bene eased of the same. Secondly it had bene dishonorable to Christ to be felow mate with the damned: and though S. Peter sayth that God raised him from death to life, the sorowes of hel being dissolued, yet he meaneth not therby that Christ once suffred the sorowes of hel, but either that he looosed vs from the sorowes of hel, or that he acquit him selfe from them, because he neuer was tormented with them. Thirdly to haue suffered these paines had bene to no purpose, because that the paynes of hel are not satisfactorie, and therfore after that the damned haue endured them many millions of yeares, they are neuer the nearer an end of their misery.

The second reason.

Acts 2.

The third.

Paines of hel are not satisfactorie.

Christes death declared his charitie sufficiently yea and his powuer also.

7. Now as concerning Christs charitie, that vvas sufficiently declared in that he suffred death for vs. For *no man hath greater charitie then to dy for his friend*, and especially for his enemies, and this also extolleth Christs power most highly, who by death ouercame death, yea sinne also, and damnation. But my hand is weary, and my pen seemeth vnwilling to yeld any more inke to a longer discourse vpon these vnchristian, yea diabolical blasphemies, and I doubt not but the Readers eares do burne already to haue heard so much of them. Out of this doctrin peraduenture proceded, that blasphemous speach of one who (as Surius reported) was not afrayed to say that Christ was damned in hel? And for this, as it is very probable, God permitted Iohn Caluin to dye so desperatly. For he that auouched Christ to haue despayred, and to haue suffred hel paynes, at the houre of his death him selfe despayred, and semed euen then to beginne his hel, because then he cursed the day that euer he set pen to paper (which we also may curse) and leauing to cal vpon Christ at his death, vvhom in his life he had so dishonoured, he called vpon the diuel, whose instrument and seruant he had bene, and vnto him rendred his miserable soule, which had deserued as many helles, as were and are the soules which were and stil are, by his doctrine deceiued.

Whence proceded Caluins desperation.

Anno. 1517.

Bolsec in vita Caluini Geneb li. 4. Cron.

The twvelueth Chapter shevveth that the Gospellers can abide nothing that is, or hath bene belonging to Christ: vvhich is an other signe that they are no sincere Christians.

IT is a common saying vsual in euery mans mouth, and yet not so common as true: *Loue men loue myn*: which not only the common voice alovveth, but also experience and reason approueth, for such is the nature of loue and frendship, that as it tranformeth one freind into an other, and maketh vs to account of our freind as an other our selfe: so doth it engender in vs an affection to our freindes freind, kinsman, alliance, seruant, and whatsoeuer belongeth to him, or is beloued of him. And the reason is manifest: for if frendship be of that nature, that it maketh one soule as it vvere in two bodyes, and causeth vs to esteme of our freind as an other our selfe, then as we first loue our selues, & then others that are linked vnto vs, so we must loue our freind as our selfe, and then his aliance for his sake, and vve must tender his life, his goods, and commodities as our owne. Wherfore we read that *Damon* and *Pithias*, did striue earnestly and contended most louingly who should dy for the other. For as the soule by affection is more vvhere it loueth, then where it liueth, so *Damon* thought him selfe to liue better in Pithias then in him selfe, and therfore to saue him selfe in Pithias, he desired to dy in him selfe. And he that loued Pithias life as his owne, would haue affected Pithias freindes and would for his sake haue tendered his good as his ovvne, we read that Dauid and Ionathas were such louing freindes, *that their soules vvere glevved together*: which loue of Dauid towards Ionathas, could not be stayd in Ionathas his person, but for his sake extended it selfe to his house and familie. King Pharao vvho extolled and loued highly Ioseph the Patriarch, loued not him alone, but for his sake entertained Iacob his father, and al his brethren. For this is the nature and lavve of frendship: *loue me loue myn*. Wherfore we see by experience that, vvhen vve loue a freind sincerly, we loue for his sake his freinds also, and aliances, yea his seruantes, yea his dogge, yea his ring.

The nature of freindship.

Freindship maketh one soule in tvvo bodies.

It maketh vs loue our frēds frend as our ovvne.

The freindship of Damō and Pithias.

Dauid and Ionathas frendship.
1. Reg. 18.
2. Reg. 9.
Gen. 45. 47.

Loue me loue myn.

ring, and image, and vvhatsoeuer hath bene deare to him or appertaining vnto him.

Charitie vvhich is frēdship betvvixt God & man vniteth vs to God.

2. And lest that any should think that frendship vvorketh this effect betwixt men only, I wil shew how charitie vvhich is the frendship that man hath vvith God, hath the same properties. For charitie maketh vs not only the seruantes of God, but his freinds also, and in a golden chayne so linketh vs vnto him, that we are as S. Paul sayth *one spirit vvith him.* In so much that S Paul sayd that now he liueth not in him selfe but in Christ, into vvhom by loue he vvas transformed, esteeming of Christ as of an other him selfe, in vvhom he thought he liued better then in him selfe. And therfore he tendered Christs honour aboue his owne commoditie, and would rather dye as in dede he did, then Christ should susteine any dishonour, and rather then he would deny him or forsake him, he denied him selfe and neglected his owne life. The like effect this loue hath euer wrought in the hartes of the Martyrs of the Church, who not only desired to dy for Christ, as Damon did for Pithias, but dyed in dede, and suffered most exquisite tormentes, lest he should susteine the least losse and domage in his honour. And certes they that for loue of Christ tendered his honour more then their owne liues, did no doubt affect and reuerence for his sake his mother: his freinds, his image, his crosse, and whatsoeuer hath beene belonging vnto him: for loue is of this nature that it extēdeth it selfe not only to our freind, but for his sake it tendereth & affecteth his alliance and freindes, yea his seruants: and for his sake it honoureth, and estemeth of his image, ring, & whatsoeuer hath bene apperteining to him. Wherfore the greatest louers and freindes that euer Christ had, to wit the Martyrs who dyed for him, and the first Christians who first receiued his law, and professed his name, did so loue him that for his sake they respected with reuerence his crosse, his image, his wordes, his Sacramentes, his Mother, his Apostles, his seruantes, yea their reliques and images.

Loue of Martyrs tovvardes Christ.

They that loued Christ, respected for his sake his Mother, and al belonging to him.

The Angels respect to our Lady for Christs sake.

3. The Angel Gabriel for the honour he owed vnto his maister Christ Iesus, speaketh vnto our blessed Lady with great reuerence and respect, because she was to be his mother, knowing that he who honoureth the sonne, must respect the mother: and S. Iohn Euangelist vvhom loue made so bold as to repose him selfe in Christs bosome, had no doubt a great respect vnto his mother, vvho was commended vnto him, and therfore some historiographers write, that he caryed her with him vnto his bishopricke of Ephesus. S. Ignatius writing to the

S. Iohns respect to her.

some

same Iohn, sayth that he was desirous to see our Lady of whom Christ was borne. S. Dionisi⁹ Areopagita desired to see the body of her, which gaue the beginning of life to him who was *the way the veritie & life it selfe. Let Marie be honored*, saith Epiphanius, *and let our Lord be adored. & let vs*, sayth S. Bernard, *cast our selues at her blessed feete.* And againe. *Let vs honor Marie because it is the Wil of God, who would haue vs haue al by Marie. Al the prayse which you can giue vnto Virgin*, sayth S. Austin, *is not so much as her dignitie deserueth. Whatsoeuer is greater*, sayth Petrus Damianus, *is lesse then this Virgin, and only God the Woorkeman, excelleth this peece of woorke.* Saint Athanasius calleth her his *Mistresse Lady* and *Queene*. S. Bernard is not afraid to cal her *Aduocate*, neither do these Saincts thinke this Queene of Saincts and Mother of God only to be worthie honor: *The honor*, saith S. Basil, *which we geue euen to other Saincts. redoundeth to our common Lord and Maister. Whosoeuer*, sayth S. Ambrose, *honoreth Martyrs, honoreth Christ also, and who despiseth Saincts, contemneth our Lord.*

S. Bern. ser. 2. super psa. Qui habitat.
S. Dionisius affectiō to her
Her 79.
Ser in signum magnum.
Ser. de aque ductu.
Ser. 35. de Sanctis.
Ser. 1. de Nat. Mariæ.
Ser. de Annunciatione.
Orat. in 40. mart
Hier. ep. ad Riparium.
Ser. 6.
Aug. ser. 1. de 55. Pet. & Paulo l. 8. ciuit. c. 28.
c. 7. Eccles. Hierarch.
Ser. 66 ad po.
In vita Paulæ
Ser. de nat. Mariæ.
orat. in ps. 35.
orat in Cypr. l. 4 hist. c. 26
in vita Const. l. 1, de Imag.
Baron. to. 1. l. 7. hist. c. 14

4 And as they honored Saincts as the frendes of God: so did they pray vnto them, to pray for them to Christ, with whom they haue greater credit aboue, then we haue here in this lower world. Of this practise S. Dionisius Areopagita S. Paules scholar maketh manifest mention and ancient record. This is S. Athanasius prayer: *O Mistresse, Lady, Queene, and Mother of God pray for vs Euen he that weareth purple*, sayth S. Chrisostom, *and is crowned with a Diademe will visit the sepulchers of the Apostles and laying al pompe aside will pray to the tent-maker Paul, and Peter the fisher to be their patrones and protectors. Fare wel o Paula*, sayth S. Hierom, *and remember Hierom thy Woorchipper. Thou wast afraide*, sayth S. Bernard, *to aproch to God the Father, he hath geuen thee* IESVS *for Mediator, but perchance in him also thou mayst feare the Diuine Maiestie: wilt thou haue an Aduocate also vnto him? haue recourse to Marie. Some Angels*, sayth S. Basil, *are called eyes, because they haue vndertaken the charge to visit vs, some are called eares, because they receiue our prayers.* S. Gregorie Nazianzen speaking of a virgin, whom S. Cyprian then a Magician, endeuored by enchantment, to inflame with loue and lust, auoucheth that she prayed to Marie the virgin, to helpe and ayde a virgin, and so a virgin ouercame, and the diuel was ouercome.

5 And as the ancient Christians honored Christ and his Saints: so did they honor and respect their Images and Reliques. Evagrius, Metaphrastes, and S Damascen make mention of an Image of Christ, which him selfe imprinted in a linen cloth by the touch of his face, and sent vnto Abagarus. Eusebius also affirmeth that he hath seene

l. 14. hist. c. 2. l. Collectã. l. de pudic. In Liturg. In Iulian. 7. Syn. act. 2. cap. 7. in vita. Hon. 3. in pent. apud Baronio. 4. pag. 34 Euſ. l. 1. c. 20 21. 22 23 Prud. l. aduerſus Sym. Amb. orat. Funeb. Theod. Seuerus. l. 2. Paul ep. 11. Socr. l. 1. c. 13. Niceph. l 8. c. 29. Catec. 10. 13. Pert. l. de corona Mil. l 2 ad Vxor. Heir. in vita Paulæ. ep. ad Euſt. prud. in hym. ante ſomnum Aug. tract. 118. Ciril. cat. 11. Chry ho. 55 in Mat & ho quod

the Image of Chriſt, which was made in memorie of the miraculous cure which Chriſt did vpon the woman afflicted with the bloudy flixe, as alſo the Image of S. Peter and S. Paul. Nicephorus, and before him Theodorus Lector writ of the Image of our Lady drawne by S. Luke, which to this day are ſome of them extãt. Tertulian talketh of chalices in which Chriſt was figured in forme of a ſhepheard carying a ſheepe on his ſhoulders. *The prieſt*, ſayth S Chryſoſtom, *inclineth his head to the Image of Chriſt. The hiſtories of Images*, ſaith S. Baſil, *I honour and adore*, that is worſhip, *for this being deliuered vnto vs from the holy Apoſtles is not to be forbidden.* And S. Ambroſe in his booke of our Lords Incarnation: *When in Chriſt vve adore the Image of God, and vvorſhip the croſſe, do vve diuide him?*

6 S Hierom ſayth: that S. Paula *caſting her ſelfe proſtrate before the croſſe, adored, as if ſhe had ſeene Chriſt hanging theron. Now*, ſayth S. Chryſoſtom, *Theodoſius the father, and his ſonne, entering the churches, do lay aſide their crounes and do make the ſigne of the croſſe in their forheades.* Gregorius Niſſenus recordeth how he found about his ſiſters necke (ſhe was called Micrina) a croſſe and ring of iron, in the knoble wherof was the ſigne of the croſſe, & vnder that, a peece of the holy croſſe, by this ſigne of the croſſe Conſtantine obtained a victorie againſt Maxentius, as that ſtrange viſion and impreſſion in the aire did ſignifie vnto him: *In hoc vince. In this ouercome.* This Croſſe was odious to al nations almoſt, til Chriſt ſanctified it with his Paſſion, but yet amongſt the Ægipties the croſſe was a letter ſignifiing *life euerlaſting*: and ſince that Chriſt vſed this croſſe as an inſtrumẽt to worke our redemption, Kings & Emperors haue placed it in their crownes, and adored it for Chriſts ſake. S. Helin, our countriwoman & Conſtantines mother, went to Hieruſalem to ſeke this croſſe And finding there the croſſe by a miracle, ſhe adored it, & ſent one peece of it to Rome an other to her ſonne Conſtantin. And one of the nayles wherwith Chriſt was nayled to the croſſe ſhe put in a bridle, an other in a crowne, & gaue them both to her ſaid ſonne, that Chriſt in his crowne might rule, and moderate in his bridle. And ſuch deuotion had the ancient chriſtians to the croſſe, that as S. Ciril of Hieruſalem witneſſeth, the whole world was filled as it vvere, vvith peeces of this croſſe, vvhich Chriſtians had procured to be cut from the ſame. With this ſigne Chriſtians vſed euer to ſigne their forheades, their mouthes, their breaſtes, & to bleſſe the table: vvith this they armed them ſelues againſt the diuel, in the morning, in the euening, in the going forth, in entering into the houſe,

before

before prayer, before meate, before euerie important busines. Without this signe no Sacrament was euer ministred, no Sacrifice offered, no benediction either of Priests or parents was giuen. S. Martin armed vvith this signe, feared not the troupes of his enemies, as Sulpitius vvriteth in his life. And therfore this signe was euer counted the standard and impenetrable armour of Christians. Constantine his Labarum, which was a crosse, wonne many victories. S. Oswald King, by avvodden crosse put his enemies to flight, and vvrought many miracles. S. Hilarian by the same signe stayed the raging sea, And neuer any miracle was done almost, without the signe of the crosse. Diuels feare this signe, & tremble at the same, knowing that by it they were ouercome And therfore they who hate the crosse may see to vvhom they belong. Yea so Christians vvere euer vvont to be deuoted vnto Christ, that for his sake they haue not only honored his Mother and Saintes nor his image, and crosse only, but al reliques of Christ and his Saints also, euen to their clothes, bones, & dust of their bodys as.

Christum sit Deus.
Euf. l 1. vita Const. c. 20. 22. 23.
Beda l. 3. hist. Aug. c. 2.
Athan. l. de Incarnat. Domini.
Aug. l. 83. q. 79.
Epiph. her 30
Basil in psal. 115.
Athan. in vita Ant.

7 And euen in the Apostles time, yea in Christs time also, we haue examples of honor & deuotion to reliques, exhibited by the first Christians. A deuout woman mentioned in the Gospel, beleued, that if she should but touch the hemme of Christs garment, she should be healed: and this her deuotion was so farre from being reprehended, that it was rewarded with the benefite of a miraculous cure, & a great cõmendation. The first Christians also made such esteeme of S Pauls hand-kerchiefe, and Semicinctia that they caried them to the sicke, & healed ther with miraculously many and sundry diseases, and dispossessed many of euil spirits. Yea such a conceipt had they of S. Peters sanctitie that they ranne to his shadow for soucour and thought that for his sake, it was to be esteemed as soueraine.

Bellar. to. 1. 2. de Reliq. c. 3.
Amb. in ser. 95.
Mat. 9.
Act. 19.
Act. 5.

What loue & respect the reformers beare to Christ vvho can not abide his mother, frends, crosse &c.

8. Let vs now compare these ancient Christians vvith our newe reformers, and if to loue our freinds alliance, be an euident signe of loue towards him, and hatred of them, must nedes argue no good meaning to him, let vs gather by the affection vvhich these men shew towards Christs freindes, vvhat zeale and affection they beare to his Person. And to beginne with the Mother of God, because she was next in dignitie vnto God, and as neare as the mother can be to the Sonne. Let vs see how reuerently they speake of this vvorthy creature. Luther sayth that the Monkes for vvomens sakes, haue extolled the virgin to much, and placed her aboue the Angels: and he is angry with the wo-

Luthers contempt of the mother of God.

man mentioned in the Gospel for calling. *the vvombe of this virgin blessed:*
Post Dom. 3. Quadr. Yea sayth he euery ministers yoke-felow may be as good as she, sauing that she can not be the mother of God, as she was. Caluin sayth that
Luc. 11. vvhen she put Christ in mynd of vvant of vvine at the mariage, *she kept*
Ser. nat Mariæ in Harm. *not her selfe vvithin her boundes*, and an other time vvhen Christ sayed,
Io. 2. *vvho is my mother and vvho are my brethren?* He carped (sayth Caluin) *at*
Caluins hate of the virgin Mother. *Maries importunitie, vvho prepostrously vvent about to interrupt his preaching.*
Yea he also findeth fault with Papistes, for vsing those vvords of the
Hea. Ma. 12. Harm. deuout woman in the Gospel *blessed be the vvombe vvhich bare thee*, because (sayth he) the woman vvas checked for so saying. Oecolampadius condemneth her of ambition vvhen she told her sonne at the
Luc. 11. mariage, that wine vvas vvanting. Brentius sayth, that vvhen she
Oecolãpadius spite against her. vvith Christs Kinsfolkes, came to speake vvith Christ, she shewed her selfe vnciuil, and exceded the bondes of publike honestie, and therfore by Christ vvas put to publike shame. The same Brentius
in Io. 1. Antid. c. 8 Luc. sayth that vvhen she had lost Christ she fel into these cogitations: *If*
Brẽtius touthe against her. *this vvere the Messias hovv happeneth it, that he is disobedient to his parentes, and so closely stealeth a vvay from them? hovv is he the Messias and author of felicitie, by vvhom as yet vve neuer had good fourtune? And vvhen* (sayth he) *this virgin and the disciples savv, that Christ vvas condemned to so shameful a death, then vvere they scandalized, and then appeared their vaine cogitations and impious hart.*
Hom. 19. Luc. Ioannes Agricola suspecteth her maydenly honestie, and maketh the
Luth. post D. post Epiph. Angel to speake like a lasciuious vvooer to her, and as one that went
Hom. 17. in Luc. about to entise her: thus he maketh him to speake: *al Hayle most gratious Lady, vvhose company al men do desire. And thinke you* (sayth he) *vvhat*
apud Canis. l. 3. c. 12. *it is to see a trime yonng man al alone vvith a meyd in a chamber close shut vp, and vsing svvete vvordes and not obscurely insinuating by vvordes & gestures hov much he desired.* O lasciuious companion that could conceue so beastly of the company of an Angel, vvho is chast by nature, and of a virgin, vvho vvas as frie from lust by grace, as an Angel by nature. If now the prouerb be true as reason and experience teacheth it to be most true: *loue me loue myn*: then Iudge gentle reader, by the respect vvhich these men beare to Christs Mother, vvhat their reuerence and affection is,
Calu. li. 1. Inst c. 12. 1. 2. l. 3. c. 20. vvhich they beare to her Sonne. Besids this it is a common opinion of theirs, that no honour or religious respect is to be giuen vnto the Mother of God, or the Saincts of heauen. And Luther seemeth much to
in Post. nat. Mariæ & post Annunciat. enuie at the honour which is giuen to our Lady, saying (but vvith a lye) that papistes make her a goddesse and runne more vnto her then vnto Christ, expecting more grace & fauour of her then of him. Melanthon

Lyth

sayth that it is plaine, that amongst papistes the blessed virgin is succeded in Christs place, and that al cal vpon her, and repose confidence in her, as though Christ vvere no propitiator, but only a Iudge and a reuenger. In vvhich as he lyeth lowlly, so he plainly bevvrayeth the enuie vvhich he conceiueth against this virgins honour. Caluin complayneth that vve adorne this virgin vvith the spoiles taken from her Sonne, and that we thinke her not honoured ynough vnlesse *she be made a goddesse.*

Luther and Caluin deny honour to Saintes.

Apol conf. Harm. c. 2. 10. Rayling against Saintes. l 3 Inst. c. 14. para. 11. in cap. 12. Exo l 3. Inst. c. 20. 27 de refor. Ecclesiæ. ex Th. Vval. to. 3. tit. 12. c. 108. ex Cal. cont. libert. c. 9.

9. As for other Saintes they so reuile them; and that vvith such bitter scoffes and flowtes, that herin I admire the patience of the diuine Maiestie, vvhich holdeth his reuenging hand. Caluin rayleth at al the Sainctes both of the old and new law. He calleth Abraham a worshipper of Idols & exaggerateth diuers sinnes of Sara & Rebecca, he accuseth Moyses the mildest & meekest man that vvas in his time, of arrogancie and pride. The Saints of the new lavv he calleth longeared creatures vvho can heare so fare of: he nicknameth them by contempt, deadmens shadowes, visards, monsters, beasts. Wherin he foloweth the stepps of his father Wiclefe, vvho calleth the Saints *Scurras principis: the Princes iesters.* And one Quintine a libertin is so fowle mouthed, that when he nameth S. Paul he calleth him the broke vessel, S. Iohn he termeth the fooliish younker, S. Mathew, the vsurer, S. Peter, the denyer.

10. They take also from al Saints the honour which is giuen them by intercession, and sutes made vnto them. Erasmus to make the way for them, maketh the blessed Virgin to say; that she liketh vvel of Luthers doctrin, vvhich teacheth that Saints are not to be prayd vnto, for novv thus he maketh her speake *I may be quiet, vvhere as before al came to me, as though my sonne vvere stil a babe.* Luther sayth that he esteemeth no more of the virgings prayers then of an other Christian; yea he denyeth al aduocation of Saincts. So doth Caluin also in many places of his institutions. And one William Roding, in a booke or libel vvhich he made against the schooles of Iesuits, who (for their teaching and bringing vp of youth especially are disliked of heretikes) bringeth in the blessed virgin speaking in this maner: Leaue of this saluting me, to honour me, leaue of worshipping of Saints, and those that are dead, we detest thy salutations and prayers, vvhere thou art, vvhat thou doest, or whether thou beest aliue or dead, vve know not, and we care not: so farre are we from hearing thy prayers.

They deny prayer to Saints. Dial. de peregrinatione. Ser. nat. virg. l. cont. Vval. l. 1. c. 16. 18. l. 3. c. 20 Roding l. cont. Schol. Iesuit.

11. As for Images and Reliques of Christ, his Mother, and his Saintes, they detest them: and therfore Luther wisheth that al Reli-

Cal. l. de ref. mag. cent. 4. 6. 6. col. 456.

Ser. de Cruce. ques vvere buried in the earth: yea their breaking and defacing of
They deny al reuerence to Images and Reliques. Images, and their burning of reliques, argueth their mynd and opinion in these matters sufficiently. VVherin they imitate Hierome of Prague, who pulled downe the Crucifix, and defiled and abused it, and yet reteined Wicleses picture crowned with a diademe: for so these men thinke the best place of their house not good ynough for Luthers and Caluins pictures, and yet deface and defile the Images of Christ, his Mother, and his Saincts.
Ex Cocl. l. 3 hist. Hussit.

An obiectiō. 12. But they say that this they do for pure loue & honour towards
Deut. 6. Christ, who should be highly iniuried, if any but he should be honou-
Mat. 4. red, and they haue a warrant for the same out of Gods owne vvord:
1. Tim. 1. *Thou shalt adore thy Lord God, and him only thou shalt serue.* And againe: *To*
The answer. *God only honour and glorie.* But yet because Scripture can not be contrary to reason, and much lesse to it self, they should haue sought meanes to haue expounded those words, rather then to haue fallen into these grosse absurdities: for the same God vvho commandeth to adore and serue him only, commandeth vs to honour our parents and to serue our maisters. And reason teacheth vs that if we honour and loue God, we must respect his frends, and those that he respecteth, for the prouerb must needs be true, *Loue me loue myn*, because it is grounded in reason, and the very nature of frendship. VVherfore I answer that God is a iealous God, and therfore wil haue supreme honour and affection giuen vnto him selfe only, because he only hath supreme soueranitie (which only the alleaged places do proue) but if it be lawful to make this argumēt, God only must haue supreme honour, ergo Saincts must haue none at al. It may also be as wel inferred, that neither our parentes, nor our Princes must be honoured, or affected.

Honour dewv to Excellencie 13. Let therfore the reformers cal to mynd, that to excellencie and
Three Excellēcies. dignitie honour is dewv, and therfore seing that there are three kinds of excellencies, vvel haue the Diuines distinguished three kindes of honours or worshipes. The first excellencie is increate and supreme,
The first Diuine. which is proper to God, and therfore to him is dew supreme honour,
The second is moral or ciuil which is called *Latria*, and to giue this honour to any creature is idolatrie. The second is called moral or ciuil excellencie, which consisteth in authoritie, moral vertue, learning, or such like, and to this is dew a ciuil honour, vvhich vve giue to Princes, and superiors, and moral honest, and learned men: for authoritie, vertue, and learning
The third supernatural. are to be respected. The third excellencie is supernatural which consisteth in grace, sanctitie, and glorie: and to this is dew a religious honour:

iour: yet becauſe this excellencie is infinitely inferior to Gods excel-encie, we muſt giue it a religious, but yet a farre inferior honour. And with this honour our bleſſed Lady, S. Ihon Baptiſt, S. Peter S. Paul, and other Saincts vvhileſt they liued, deſerued to be reſpected, and ſithence that their Sanctitie is no leſſe in heauen then it was in earth, they are no leſſe after death to be honoured, then they were li-ing. And therfore as ciuile honour giuen to Princes, learned, and mortal men, derogateth not from Gods honour, becauſe it is infe-ior, ſo neither doth this religious honour, becauſe it is alſo inferior.

What honour is devv to Saints.

14. But Caluin ſayth that religious honour is only devv to God. This he affirmeth but he can not proue it, and therfore I deny it, and vil proue the contrarie. For religion is a vertue which giueth to God ſupreme vvorſhip, and to Saincts, and holy thinges, inferior honour, and ſo reſpecteth euery one in his kind. To God this vertue giueth a ſupreme honour called *Latria*, to the Saincts an inferior honour called *Dulia* to the bleſſed virgin becauſe ſhe farre excelleth the other Saincts, ſo giueth an honour inferior to *Latria* but ſuperior to *Dulia*, which Di-ines therfore cal *Hyperdulia*. And I would demande of Caluin, if S. Iohn Baptiſt were in earth, whether he would honour him or no for his ſanctitie? If he ſay he would, then I aske of him, what honour he vvould giue him? not ſupreme honour, becauſe that is devv to God, not ciuil honour: becauſe that is giuen to moral vertue only, au-thoritie, and learning. What honour then ſhal S. Iohn Baptiſt haue for his ſanctitie? certainly either an inferior religious honour called *Dulia* or none at al. And if Caluin would honour him in earth, & religiouſly alſo for his ſanctitie, vvhy feareth he to giue him that honour in hea-uen, ſithence that his ſoule (vvhich is the proper ſubiect of ſanctitie) is no leſſe liuing there, then it was here, and is indewed with no leſſe ſanctitie in heauen, then is was in earth, and beſides that, is alſo there enriched with glorie, which it had not here?

Religõ giueth to God. Latria. to Saints. Dulia. to our Lady Hyperdulia. A queſtion.

15. Now if Caluin wil ſay, that at leaſt Images and Reliques are not to be honoured, becauſe in them is none of theſe three excellen-cies aforementioned, I wil tel him, that although none of theſe excel-lencies be formally in Images or Reliques, yet becauſe theſe are ap-pertaining vnto them, vvho are honoured, they may and muſt alſo be reſpected and reuerenced (but with a farre inferior reſpect) and that for their ſakes to vvhom they apperteined. For as the Prince and Supe-rior hath only the ciuil excellencie, and yet not he only, but for his ſake, his image, his chaire of eſtate, his ring, and after his death, his

What honour is devv to Reliques and Images.

A ſimilitude

dead

dead body also, is to be respected, but yet not vvith that honour wherewith his ovvne person is honoured, so if God and his Saincts may be honoured with religious honour, thé for Gods sake his image may be respected, and for Christs sake his name, his worde, his Sacramentes, his Crosse, nayles, and other thinges belonging vnto him, and for the Saincts sake, their images, bodyes, bones, clothes, and such like, may and must be religiously honoured, yet with an inferior honour. And the reason is first because in these things also by a certaine participation and representation, we behold in some sorte their excellencie to whom they pertaine, and therfore we respect them for their sakes. Secondly the nature of frendship wil haue it so, that if vve honour and loue any freind, vve must respect for his sake al belonging vnto him.

The first reaso

the second.

Caluins obiection.

16. But Caluin wil say, that greater would be the honour of Christ, if vve gaue al honour to him, and none at al to his Saincts: vvhich he affirmeth and I with more reason do deny. For as then I honour and loue my Prince best, when I so repect him, that I honour and loue not him only, but for his sake his alliance, his frends, his officers, his seruantes his image, yea his ring: so do I honour and loue Christ most, when for his sake I respect and honour his Mother, his officers the Apostles, his freindes the Saincts, yea his Crosse and Image. And Princes take it for a dishonour to haue their officers, seruants, and images abused, and count it an honour to be honoured not only in themselues, but also in their adherentes: so no doubt Christ accounteth the honour doone to Saincts (because it is giuen them for his sake, and because they are his freinds and seruants) as giuen to him selfe, and cannot but conceiue him selfe to be highly dishonoured, when his Saincts especially his Mother, are reuiled, and his Crosse and Images are defaced and defiled. Wherfore let not the reformers cal vs Idolaters, lest they bewray their ignorance. For Idolatrie is to giue supreme honour dew to God, vnto his creatures, as it is treason to giue supreme ciuil honour dew to the Prince, vnto any of his subiects But as it is no treason nor iniurie, but rather honour to the Prince, to honour his officers and seruants, with an inferior honour for his sake, so is it no Idolatrie but Religion, to honour the Saints of God with an inferior honour for their Maisters sake.

Catholiques no Idolators.

What treason is.

A similitude

17. And if Saincts may be honoured, we may make intercessio vnto them, because it is an honour to Princes retainers, to haue suite made vnto them. And this may be doone also vvithout dishonour to

Christ

Christ, becauſe to him we giue vvhat is dew, towit the title of a Redemer, and chiefe Aduocate, Mediator, and Interceſſor: and we acknowledge Saints as ſecondarie Mediators and Interceſſors, vvhom we deſire for the credit vvhich they haue vvith Christ, greater then we haue, to make interceſſions to him for our neceſſities. And ſo we pray otherwiſe to Christ, otherwiſe to Saincts: to him we pray as to our ſupreme Aduocate, to them as to ſecondarie Mediators, who haue no acceſſe to God but by him: to him vve pray as vnto him that beſtoweth grace, health, and ſuch other benefits on vs, to them we pray not to beſtow thoſe benefites, but to pray to him to beſtow them on vs. To him we pray as an Interceſſor vnto his Father by him ſelfe, to them as to Interceſſors by him, and therfore al our prayers to Saintes we conclude *by Chriſt our Lord*. And if ſome tymes we deſire our Lady, and other Saints to ſend vs health, or to giue vs grace, our meaning is no other, then to deſire them to procure of Chriſt theſe benefits for vs, by their prayer and interceſſion. But Saincts, ſayth Caluin, can not heare vs ſo farre of. I grant they can not naturally, nor by corporal eares, for as yet they haue none at al, but I ſay God vvho reuealed many future thinges to his Prophetes, reuealeth alſo vnto Saincts al thinges which are belonging vnto them, amõgſt which are the prayers vvhich are made vnto them: and I auouch with the Diuines and holy Fathers, that as they ſee God face to face, ſo in him they ſee and know euen our cogitations, prayers, and vvhatſoeuer is belonging vnto them. Wherfore I may iuſtly ſuſpect our Reformers ſinceritie to Chriſt, vvho can abide neither his Mother, nor his Saincts, not his Croſſe, nor Image, nor any thing belonging vnto him: becauſe the nature of frendſhip is ſuch, that if they loue and honour him they muſt loue and honour his frends and ſeruants.

VVe pray to Saintes vvithout preiudice to Chriſt.

Hovv vve pray to Saints hovv to Chriſt.

Hovv Saints heare ſo farre of.

S.Th. 1.p q 12 a.8 Aug l.de triplici habit. c.6 l.13. conf. c.15. Greg l.4 Dial. c.35. Gen. 18.19.

18. Here I could demonſtrate out of Scripture the honour dew to Saintes, becauſe Scripture auoucheth that Abraham, Loth, Balaam, and Ioſue vvorſhipped Angels: that Abdias honoured Elias, and the ſonnes of the prophetes reuerently reſpected Elizeus, vvho now are much more worthy honour, then they were in this mortal life, and may accept of it as wel now without preiudice to Chriſts honour, as then. That Nabuchodonozor adored Daniel, that Cornelius adored Peter not for a God, becauſe he before that was a worſhipper of the true God, but as an holy man, and though S. Peter refuſed that honour yet he did it of modeſtie as S. Chriſoſtom affirmeth: and might otherwiſe haue accepted it. S. Ihon the Euangeliſt adored an Angel twiſe,

Num. 22. Ioſ. 5. 3. Reg. 18. 2. Reg. 2. Dan. 2. Act. 10. Chryſ. ibidem. Apoc. 19. & 22

knowing him to be an Angel, and therfore vnleſſe we vvil ſay that an Apoſtle, and he that ſucked out of Chriſts boſome ſuch high Diuinitie that for his high ſoaring in contemplation he is compared to an Egle, knew not vvhat honour to giue to an Angel, we muſt allow of worſhip of Angels and conſequently of Saincts, vvhoſe ſoules are no leſſe liuing, and although the Angel refuſed ſuch honour, yet that was of modeſtie, and for honour of Prieſthood.

Hier. 151. 19. Prayer to Saincts is alſo proued by Scripture, as where God ſayd, *If Moyſes and Samuel ſhould ſtand before him* (to wit to make interceſſion for the people) *yet his ſoule vvould not be vvith that people*, he giueth vs to ſuppoſe that they may pray for the people. That viſion alſo of *Iudas Machabeus* in which he ſavv *Onias* and *Hieremie*, then not liuing, yet praying for him and his armie, doth argue that Saincts pray for vs, and conſequently that we may pray vnto them. And this S. Ihon confirmeth by an other viſion in vvhich he ſaw the twentie fowre Seniors proſtrated before the throne of God *hauing euery one harpes and golden vials ful of odours vvhich are* (ſayth he) *the prayers of Saincts.* Yea the Angel Raphael ſayth that he offered vp Tobias prayers vnto God: and an other Angel prayeth for the people, as Zacharie vvitneſſeth in the beginning of his Prophecie. The like example of prayer to an Angel we read in Oſee: and Iacob bleſſing the Sonnes of Ioſeph prayeth that his Angel who had deliuered him from al dangers would vouchſafe to bleſſe them: and wiſheth that his owne name and the name of Abraham & Iſaac may be called vpon for them. To be briefe Angels reioice at the conuerſion of a ſinner, *Ergo* they knovv the ſtate of ſinners, and conſequently their charitie moueth them to pray for them, which alſo argueth that we may pray to them. And vvhy haue we Angels vvhich are called our Gardians (as Chriſt him ſelfe ſayth we haue) but to protect and pray for vs? And ſeing that the ſoules of the bleſſed, are immortal as Angels are, ſee God face to face as they do, and are indewed vvith glorie as they are, they alſo can heare our prayers, as wel as Angels, and ſo are to be prayed vnto as wel as they. We haue many examples alſo of the prayers of Saincts in this life, and ſeing that the ſoules of dead Saintes are liuing, and haue eyes and eares of ſoule to ſee our neceſſities, and to heare our petitions, vvhy may we not pray to them, and that without iniurie to Chriſt, as vvel as to the liuing Saintes.

2. Mach. 15. *This booke is admitted of S. Auſt. l. de cura pro mortuis ex l* 8. *ciuit. c.* 3. *Cypr. Exhort. ad Mart. Amb. l.* 2. *de Iacob c.* 9. 11 *yea Lut. in prefat. l.* 1. *Mac. admith this booke.* *yea Io.* 10. *mẽtiõ is of a feaſt inſtituted by Iudas Mach.* *Apoc.* 5. *Tob.* 12. *Zach.* 1 *Oſee* 12. *Gen.* 48. *Mat.* 1. *See Gen.* 48. *Io.* 5. 19. 33. *Exod.* 12.

Apoc. 8. 20. Now that their Images and Reliques may be worſhipped, it is as manifeſt in the two Cherubins placed by the Arke, in the braſen

1. Reg. 7. ſerpent

ſerpent, in the tranſlation of Iacobs and Ioſephs bones & the reuerent and deuout burial of S. Stephen. Yea the reſpect vvhich was borne towards the Arke, Manna, the Tables of the law, and Aarons rodde, vvhich vvere religiouſly kept in the Arke, argueth no leſſe. And Moyſes putting of his ſhovves, becauſe the earth was holy: Chriſts hēme of his garment vvhich the woman ſo deuoutly touched, S. Pauls napking, Helias clocke, & Helizeus body whoſe touch reuiued a dead body, vvhat elſe do they inſinuate, but the aforeſayd reaſon grounded in the nature of frendſhip which ſayth, *loue me and loue myn, honour me and honour myn, euen to my ſeruant and image*, and the abſurditie which foloweth contempt of Saintes, Images and Reliques, though we lay aſide Scriptures. Fathers, Tradition, Hiſtories and al monumentes, is an argument ſufficient for the proofe of the worſhip, & reſpect which is dew vnto them.

Iob vlt
Rom.15.
Epheſ. 6.
2.Theſ.9.
Col.4.
Heb.3.& vlt.
Iac. 5.
Ex 25. Num.
22 Gen.50.
Act. 8.
Heb.9.1.Reg.
8.Exod. 25.
Ex. 3.
Mat. 9
Act.19.
4 Reg.2.&3.

21. And to make it more manifeſt, I wil propoſe an example, vvhich ſhal lay open vnto the vew of any reaſonable man, the abſurditie vvhich foloweth contempt of theſe thinges, and the traiterous meaning towerds Chriſt, vvhich it implyeth. Put the caſe that ſome one in Englād of his Maieſties ſubiects, ſhould profeſſe great loyaltie, loue, and honour vnto him, yet could not abide to heare a good word of his glorious mother, yea would reuile her, and miſcal her, but vnder this pretence that his Maieſtie is now to haue al the honour, and that no honour can be giuen to the mother, but ſo much is taken from the ſonne. Suppoſe he ſhould paſſe by his Lord Chauncelor, & Treaſurer, without mouing cap, and appeare before his honourable counſail without bowing of body, or bending of knee, and being demanded whether his cap were not nayled to his head, or whether his knee wanted not a ioint, he ſhould anſwer them, that his cap is nayled to al but his Maieſtie, and his knee is ſtiffe to al but his owne good ſelfe: Suppoſe alſo he ſhould deſpiſe his fauourites, and hate them as much as he affecteth them, proteſting that he only loueth his Maieſtie, to vvhom he giueth ſo much of his affectiō, that he hath none left for his freinds or welwillers. Suppoſe that vvhen he entereth into the chamber of preſence he ſhould make no more reuerence to his Chaire, then to an alehouſe bench, Suppoſe that vvhenſoeuer he meeteth with his Graces picture, he ſhould deface and defile it, and ſhould caſt into the fiere vvhat ſoeuer he findeth that hath bene vſed by him, and al vnder this pretence that he giueth al reſpect vnto his owne perſon, and wil not giue any at al to any thing elſe, be it neuer ſo nere, or ſo deare vnto

4 Reg.2.&3. the reformers traitours to Chriſt.

him, leſt he ſhould ſeeme to part ſtakes, and not to giue al honour and affection to his Highnes: Suppoſe alſo that he ſhoud ſtop al ſuters vvhich are made vnto his Chaunlcer, Treaſurer, Counſailers, and other officers, auouching that ſuch ſuters are traitors to his Maieſtie, vvho in that they goe not to him immediatly, do ſeme not to put that confidence in him, vvhich his goodnes requireth, but rather do imagine that either he is not able of him ſelfe, or elſe not ſo willing as able: would you take this man to be a loyal ſubiect: or would you not (notwith ſtanding al theſe his goodly pretẽces and ſolemne proteſtations) ſuſpect his ſinceritie? and might you not iuſtly feare, leſt after contempt of al that are belonging vnto his Maieſtie, he would lay violent hands vpon his owne perſon? Truly I doubt not but that ſuch a one vvould quickly be areſted, and apprehended for a traytour.

The applicatiõ of the Exãple.

22. The like caſe is betwixt Chriſt Ieſus, and theſe new reformers, and zelators. They profeſſe al honour, dutie, and affection to Chriſt, but they reuile his Mother, and wil haue no honour giuen vnto her, leſt that in honouring the Mother they ſhould diſhonour the Sonne. They beare no reſpect vnto Chriſts chiefeſt officers the Apoſtles, to whom he cõmitted his Church at his departue. They fouour not at al the freinds and fouorits of Chriſt, the Saincts, and Angels: and this they ſay they do for feare leſt they ſhould incurre Chriſts diſfauour, in fauouring them vvhom he him ſelfe fauoured. When they meete with the image of Chriſt, or of his Mother, or freindes, they deface and defile it. When they ſee the Croſſe of Chriſt they ſwel at the very ſight of it, as if they were poſſeſſed, and can no more abide it, then can the diuels, vvho becauſe he hateth Chriſt can not brooke his Croſſe. If they ſhould hit vpon any bone of Chriſts frendes, they would ſputne at it, and if any relique of Chriſt, or his Mother, or his Apoſtles, and other Saints, ſhould be in their way, if a dunghil were not nere hand, they would caſt it into the fier. Al ſutes and requeſtes, vvhich are made to the Mother of God, or any Saint, officer, or freind of Chriſt, they forbid and condemne as iniurious to Chriſt as though (ſay they) Chriſt were not able or willing ynough of him ſelfe, but that the vvay muſt be made by Mediators and Interceſſors. Theſe are their goodly pretences, but vvhat litle ſigne of true meaning towards Chriſt therby is ſhewed, the law of frendſhip ſhal determine, vvhich telleth vs, that if we loue our freind we muſt loue his aliance, freinds, and al appertaining vnto him euen vnto his dogge. And if in the other

caſe of

case of that braging subiect, vvho pretendeth great honour to his Maiestie, sentence would be pronounced against him as against a traytour, because although he professe great loue and honour towards him, yet he declareth contrarie in the contempt of his Mother, frends and officers, I see not how any indifferent Iudge can condemne him for a traytour to his Maiestie, vnles he pronounce these also traytours vnto Christ his person: because where the case is like, and the cause the same, and only the persons different: if the sentéce be not the same, the Iudge is partial, and an accepter of persons. *The cõclusion.*

THE FOVRTH BOOKE CONTEINETH A GENERAL SVRVEY OF THEIR RELIGION AND WORSHIP OF GOD. IN WHICH it is proued, that they haue either no Religion at al, or a graceles Religion.

The first Chapter shevveth hovv Prieſtes and Religion euer vvent together, and that the reformers haue no Prieſtes, and conſequently no Religion.

THE old Lavv being abrogated as able only to ſhew the way, but not to giue force to walke in the ſame, to command but not to giue grace to obey: the old Sacraments being antiquated and aboliſhed, as ſignes only which repreſented grace, but could not effectuate it: the old Prieſtes alſo by good conſequēce were turned out of office, as able only to iudge betwixt corporal lepreſies, and to abſolue from legal irregularities: becauſe the Law, Sacraments, and Sacrifices, being aboliſhed, there was no vſe of the Prieſts, vvho vvere ordayned only for one of theſe three offices, that is to preach and interprete the Law, to miniſter Sacraments, or to offer Sacrifice. And in lieu of the old Law, a new Law by Chriſt being eſtabliſhed, which was written not with the fingers of an Angel as the old was, but of the Holy Goſt, and not in ſtones as that was, but in the hartes of men: new Sacraments alſo being inſtituted not only to ſignifie grace, but alſo to ſanctifie. New Prieſts of neceſſitie were to be appointed, to interprete this Law, and to mi-

Heb. 5.

Exod. 24.

to minister these Sacraments: because Law, Religion, & Priestes, euer went together, and therfore as S. Paul sayth the one being altered, the other was to be changed. Three Lavves there are by which God hath ruled his people, to wit, the Law of nature, the written law, & the Law of grace: in al which, as I haue declared in the last chapter of the first booke, were Priestes, and they also diuerse, according to the diuersitie of Lavves. Wherfore if Christ hath planted a Church, and in it established a Law and Religion, certainly he hath also appointed a succession of Priestes, because they euer go together, and haue such a connexion, that the one can not stand without the other. For if there be no Priests to offer Sacrifice, and to minister Sacramentes, and to interpret the Law, no shew or face of Religion can remaine, & as wel may a Kingdom florish without a Princeor magistrate, as Religion vvithout Priests, and Bishops. Wherfore, as I proued before, in the Law of nature the first begotten of euerie familie was a Priest, and in the law written, the tribe of Leuie was deputed, and dedicated vnto Priesthod. In which tribe there were inferior Priests so many that Dauid was fayne to diuide them into twenty fovvre rankes, which also conteined a great number. There were also Leuits who had inferior offices. And there were high Priestes which succeeded, one after an others death, to the number of fovvre score and odde, and the last High Priest was Finasius, who liued, vntil the Citie of Hierusalem with the Temple, was beseeged and ruined by Titus and Vespasian. These Priestes and Leuites losing their office with the abrogation of the old lavv, Christ IESVS vvho gaue vs a nevv lavv, appointed a nevv Priesthood, of vvhich he him selfe vvas the first Priest, and the principal, and the only High Priest, to vvhom no man succedeth in the same authoritie: and therfore S. Paul putteth a difference herin betvvixt the old & the nevv lavv, that in the old lavv many High Priestes vvho succeeded one an other vvere necessarie, because one dying, an other vvas of necessitie to succede lest the Church should, vvāt an High Priest, but in the nevv lavv there is but one High Priest Christ IESVS, and he is sufficient, because though he dyed, yet he rose again, and neuer gaue ouer the office, but stil offereth Sacrifice, and stil ministreth Sacraments, by the hands of his vnder Priestes. So that he only is the High Priest of the nevv lavv, & none but he, because no man succedeth him in the same authoritie.

Heb. 7
There Lavves.
See the first booke & sixt chapter.
Priests in al lavves neeessarie.
The reason.
In the first booke, & 6.c.
Ios. l. 2. cont. App. Tol. in Io. c. 18.
Ios. l. 22. Ant c 8. Tob. in Io. c. 18.
The old Priest put out of office.
Heb. 7
Christ the only High Priest
See the third booke, & 6.c.

2. But here the aduersarie vvil insult, and say vnto me, that I haue affirmed that vvhich he desired. For if Christ be the only High Priest of the

An obiectiō.

of the new law, what nede we any Popes, Bishops, and Priests? Thus
The answer. he argueth: but with how litle reason a blind man may see. For as it is no good argument, to say that now in England Scotland and Ireland, can be but one King at once, therfore there must be no Viceroyes, nor Deputies, nor Chancelers, nor Treasurers, nor Dukes, nor Noble men, who are the Princes Officers, and Princes in their kind, and vicegerentes also, some in more ample some in lesse ample maner: so it is no good argument to say that Christ is the only High Priest of the new law, *Ergo* there are no other Priests but he. For he may haue many vicegerentes, who also are true Priests in their kind. And so the Pope may be his supreme Vicare in earth, and other Bishops an Priests may also be inferior Vicars & Priests subordinate in iurisdiction vnto
Visible vnder Priest necessarie the Pope. Yea seing that the High Priest Christ IESVS hath vvithdravvne his visible presence from the Church, and executeth not visibly and immediatly by him selfe his priestly function, it vvas necessary that to his visible Church, he should leaue a visible succession of Priests, who should rule and minister vnder him & for him, in his absence, not as his successors, but as his vicegerents & ministers: for as no Priest, no
Mat. 26. Io. 20. Io. 21. Church, so no visible Priest no visible Church. Wherfore when Christ was to bid his Church fare wel he instituted his Apostles Priests, giuing them authoritie to consecrate, & to offer Sacrifice, & after his Resurrection giuing them povver also to absolue from sinnes, and appointing
Sess. 28. Can. 2 Peter as the High Priest & Vicare vnder him selfe, which to deny were not only to contradict the Councel of Trent defining that in the place alleaged Christ made the Apostles Priests (vvhich Protestants thinks
The Apostles Priests they may boldly do) but also to contemne and condemne the vvhole Schoole of ancient Fathers and interpreters, yea the vvhole Christian world, who haue so interpreted the places alleaged.

They did the office. Act. 18. 3. This Priestly function the Apostles in their tyme did exercise in preaching, teaching, baptising, confirming, and offerring Sacrifice also, which is the proper function of a Priest. Yea their Disciples did
So did their Disciples. the same. For S. Luke sayth that they *ministred vnto our Lord*, that is sacrificed as the Greeke word, *Litourgeoundon* signifieth, and as Erasmus him selfe translateth, yea as the maner of speach also importeth. For if they had only preached, or ministred Sacraments, wel might haue bene sayed to haue ministred to the People, but not so properly to
1. Tim. 4. 2. Tim. 1 Hier. in. c. 58. Isa. our Lord, vnles they had offered Sacrifice, which is proper to him. S. Paul sayth that Timothie was ordained Bishop by imposition of hands of the *Presbyterie*, that is, a company of Bishops, & he affirmeth

that

that he him ſelfe impoſed his hands vpon him: vvhich impoſition of hands is in greeke called *Chirotonia* & as S. Hierome vvitneſſeth, ſignifieth giuing of holy Orders. The ſame S. Paul writing vnto Titus, ſayth that he left him at Creta, that he ſhould *conſtitute and ordaine Prieſts in euery citie.* The ſame S. Paul with Barnabas, ordained *to the people Prieſts in euery Church*, by impoſition of hãds, as the greeke word *Chirotoniſantes* importeth. The ſame S. Paul, as S. Luke reporteth, ſent to Epheſus and called the Elders of the Church, that is Prieſts, for to them he ſayd: *Looke to your ſelues and vnto your flo-ke.* And of Prieſts he ſpeaketh vvhen he ſayth: *Prieſts vvhich do rule vvel, are vvorthy duble honour.* And againe: *Againſt a Prieſt receiue no accuſation vnder tvvo or three vvitneſſes.* Of Prieſts alſo ſpeaketh S. Iames vvhen he ſayth: *If any be diſeaſed among you let them cal for the Prieſts of the Church.* And becauſe our Goſpellers ſee that by theſe it is manifeſt, that in the Apoſtles tymes Prieſts were ordeined, they are forced (for other wiſe they could not cõceale this from the people) to tranſlate *Elders* for *Prieſtes*, notwithſtanding that the greeke word, yea the Latin, Spaniſh, French and Italian, ſoundeth as much as Prieſt in Engliſh.

Tit. 1. *Act. 14.* *Act. 26.* *1. Tim. 3.* *Io. 5.*

Presbiter. *Preſtre.* *Prete.* *Prieſt.*

4. Of Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons we haue mention in the Canons of the Apoſtles, And the Councel of Nice: And Ignatius Biſhop of Antioch and ſcholar of S. Paul, in diuerſe of his Epiſtles ſpeaketh of the ſame. In his Epiſtles to the Epheſians this is his admonition: *Endeuour my deareſt to be ſubiect to the Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, becauſe he that obeyeth them, obeyeth Chriſt Who appointed them.* And againe in an other Epiſtle he giueth the reaſon, vvhy we ſhould obey them: For vvhat (ſayth he) *is a Biſhop, but one vvho is aboue al principalitie, and is as much (as a man can be) an imitator of Chriſt? Vvhat is Prieſthood but an holy company, counſaylers, and aſſiſtants to the Biſhop? Vvhat are Deacons but imitators of Angels vvho exhibit a pure and harmeles miniſtery, as S. Stephen did to S. Iames, S. Timothie and S. Line to S. Paul, Anacletus and Clemens to S. Peter?* And in an other place he reckeneth almoſt al the inferior Orders of the Clergie: *I ſalute Subdeacons, Lectors, Singers, Ianitors, Exorciſts*: and ſo forth. By vvhich it is plaine, that in the Church of Chriſt euen from the beginning, there vvas a Clergie of Biſhops, Prieſts, and inferior Miniſters, and that the Church, and they euen from the beginning, went together, and by later writers and hiſtories it is moſt manifeſt, that Prieſtood vvas an Order vvhich euer floriſhed in the Church of Chriſt, ruled alſo in it, and vpholded it. And truly Religion, and Prieſtood, are ſo inſeparately vnited, that the very Paganes as they practiſed ſuper-

Canon. Apo. *Conc. Nic.* *Ignat. ep. ad Eph.* *Ep. ad Tral.* *Ep ad Anti.* *Prieſts & the Church & Religion vvent euer together.*

stition and Idolatrie in steed of Religion: so did they deuise a kind of Clergie and order of Priests, to rule their Church in spiritual matters, to offer their Sacrifices, and to minister their Sacraments, as in the pagane writers is most manifest to be sene.

5. Now that there is no true Priesthood amongst the Gospellers, them selues do confesse, and I shal also proue it: but first let vs take their owne confession. Luther sayth plainly that al are priests alike, and that Christians are not ordained but borne Priests in baptisme. Only (sayth he) this is the difference, that to auoid confusion, the execution of priestly authoritie is committed to some only. And this is the opinion of al the reformers, euen in England, who as they acknowledge no proper and true Sacrifices but only improper, such as prayer is, and a contrite hart: so they acknowledge no other Priests, then those who offer prayer and thankes-giuing, and such like improper sacrifices vnto God. And because al may offer such sacrifices, al with them are priests alike. And so the minister is no more Priest then the minstrel, only the minister by election, or by the Princes lettre, hath the execution of this priestly function committed vnto him. Whence it followeth that there is no Hierarchie by their opinion amõgst them, nor distinction of the state of Clergie and Laitie in order, dignitie, and power, but only in execution. Wherfore seing that al are not true and proper Priests, there is no true Priestood amongst them at al. This they grant, and by their proofe and argument, by which they proue al to be Priests alike, they declare their meaning. For their principal proofe is taken out of S Peter and S. Iohn, who say that Christ hath made vs al a *holy nation a Royal Priesthood and Priests to God his Father:* which wordes argue only that we are metaphorical and improper Priests who in that we are to offer vnto God vpon the Altar of our soule prayse, thankes-giuing, prayer, contrition, and such like vertues, do in some sorte resemble true Priests, who offer true Sacrifices vpon true Altars: but as our soules are not true Altars, nor our vertues true Sacrifices, so are not al true Priestes. And therfore S. Peter as he calleth vs Priests so he calleth vs Kings, liuing stones, and spiritual houses and therfore as we are not al proper and true Kinges, as we are not true stones and houses: so are we not al true Priests. And seing that by this their opiniõ we are al Priests alike, there is no true priesthood amongst them, by their opinion, and so no Church nor Religion. For although there is in Christs Church true Priesthood distinct from the state of the Laitie, in caracter, order, consecration, and power,

L. de abrog. Missal ad Bragenses de Instit. ministris.

The reformers say that al are priests alike.

1. *of Pet.* 2.

Apoc. 2.

I hau

haue already proued, yet in their opinion there is none, and so amongst them by their owne confession, is no Religion. Because to vphold Religion, not only improper Priests, such as euer were al the faythful, are required, but also proper Priests, such as differed in state from the rest of the multitude, and offered true Sacrifices, were euer in euery law necessarie: and true Priestes and true Religion as yet euer vvent together.

6. And truly as they teach so it is amongest them. For in their Church there can be no true Priests nor Priesthood, as I wil in a word or two demonstrate. And first of al if they haue any true Priests amongst them, let him shew vs a succession of them from the Apostles, else can they not proue them to be true Priests, for if Christ ordained his Apostles Priestes, and in them began the goodly order and ranke of Priests, which by succession he would alvvayes haue to cortinew in his Church for the vpholding of Religion in the same, then certes they are no true Priests, who can not deriue their pedegree from the Apostles, as Catholique Priests can do, but bastard and apish ministers, vvho cary the name and coate of Priests, and arrogate vnto them selues that office, but are no more Priests in dede, then are their minstrels & coblers. Secondly vvho in Gods name layed hands vpon them? VVhat Bishops ordained them? not Catholique Bishops I am sure, and they them selues vvil think it no credit to fetch their pedegree from them: not their owne Bishops: becaus before Luther and Caluin, who were no Bishops them selues: neuer any Superintendent of their sect, was seene, felt, or heard of: and before Luther and Caluin, there could be no Lutheranes nor Caluinists, much lesse Lutherane, and Caluinistical Superintendents. Wherfore in the beginning of their new Religion they were enforced to make Superintendentes & ministers of our Apostating Priests such as Parker, Grindal, Sands, Horne, and many others were, who were thought paste fitte to make such superintendents and ministers, without ny other moulding. And vvhere they vvanted Apostataes who were consecrated after the Catholique maner, they tooke laymen of their owne, of vvhich some were base artificers, and vvithout any other consecration or ordination then the Princes or the Superintendents letters, (who them selues were no Bishops) they made them ministers and Bitsheeps with as few ceremonies, and les solennitie, then they make their Aldermen, yea constable, and cryers of the market. And from this stocke procedeth al the rable of their ministers who are no more Priests then they

no true priests in the new church.

the first proue *Mat. 29.* *Ephes. 4.*

the second.

were that made them. The like ordination & institution of ministers

l præsc. vltra med. Tertullian recordeth to haue bene practised by the Heretikes of his tyme: *Their ordinations* (sayth he) *are light, rash, inconstant: one while they make ministers of Neophits, an other while of lay men, and those who are tyed to the world, an other while of our Apostatats, that they may bynd them vnto them by glorie, whom they can not by veritie. Wherfore one Bishop they haue to day, an other to morow, to day he is made a Deacon, who to morow is reader, to day he is a Priest, who to morow is a layman, for to lay men they inioyne priestly functions.* They wil say perchance that our Apostating Bishops could make Bishops, and that so continueth a succession of true Priests amongst them. But then I must tel them, that Luther and Caluin, and many others were neuer Bishops amongst vs and so could make no Priests, and those that were Bishops, vsed not the right forme of ordination, and so they also made no true Priests, but only prophane ministers, as I haue proued in the first booke and first chapter. If then they haue no Priests, they haue none who hath authoritie to minister Sacraments, to offer Sacrifice, and to preach to the people, and so can haue no Religion, because Priests & Religion must euer go together.

l. cont. Lucif. Thus S. Hierom reiecteth & refuteth the Sect of Luciferians: *Hilarius* (sayth he) *who was the head of the Luciferians, when being a Deacon he departed from the Church, and he alone with his companions, as he thinketh, became the only company and Church of the world, can neither cõsecrate the Eucharist, hauing neither Bishops, nor Priests, neither can he giue baptisme without the Eucharist* (For then Baptisme, the Eucharist, & Confirmation, were giuen together) *& now he being dead, his Sect & Church is dead with him, because he being but a Deacõ, could ordaine no Clerk to succede him, & that is no Church which hath no Priest.* Thus he argued against the Luciferians, & the same argument do I make against al the new Sects of this age: You haue no true Priests by your owne doctrin, neither in dede can you haue any, because al your ministers were ordayned without order, that is without consecration & imposition of Bishops hands, & they haue their authoritie from them, who being lay men, could neither haue it them selues, nor giue it to others; and seing that Religion and Priests of necessitie did euer go together, as is already proued, you hauing no true Priests, can haue no true Religion: and so your preachings, Bishopping, and supping, or communicating, and your administrations of other Sacraments (Baptisme only excepted, which in necessitie lay men, yea women may minister) are no more actes of Religion, then if the same were done by players vpon the stage, because you haue no more Priestly authoritie then they

No true ministerie amongst the new reformers.

A stage play only of Religion.

they haue, and so haue no true Religion amongst you, but only an apish imitation, and a Stage-play of Religion.

The second Chapter proueth that Religion can not stand vvithout a true Sacrifice, and that the reformers haue no true Religion, beeause they haue no Sacrifice.

MAN being composed of soule and body, is to serue his Creator vvith both, and therfore must not only beleue vvith hart, but must professe also his beleefe with tongue, and must not only prayse God in spirit, but must vse his mouth also as a trompet to sound out his prayse: neither must he pray with soule only, but vvith lippes also: and he ought not only to humble his mynd in prayer, but to bow and bend his knee and body also, and he is not only to mynd and meane wel, but he must also do wel, *to glorifie his Father vvhich is in heauen*, and to edifie his brother in earth. Which thing is so deeply imprinted in the mynds of men, that there were neuer any, either religious or superstitious, whose inward deuotion did not breake forth into some outvvard signes or ceremonies, by which was manifested outwardly, and by some action or gesture of the body, what was inwardly conceiued and concealed in the mynd.

God must be serued vvith soule & body

Mat 5.

External vvordes necessarie.

2. And amongst al the external worshipps and outvvard signes of inward deuotion & Religion, Sacrifice was euer counted the principal, vvhich therfore, as S. Austin noteth, was neuer offered but either to God, or to some creature, vvhich was esteemed of as God. And therfore al nations of what religion soeuer they vvere, haue euer vsed to offer Sacrifice, as though they thought that they gaue not vnto their God his right honour and vvorshipp, vnles they should offer vnto him one Sacrifice or other. Plinie reporteth that the people of Sabea offered as sacrifices vnto their Gods al maner of spices but myrhe, wherwith that countrie aboundeth: others haue offered fruites and herbes of the earth, others brute beasts, others haue sacrificed children and men vnto their Gods: vvherin though many superstitions and abominable idolatries vvere cõmitted, yet thereby appeareth that no sooner

Sacrifice the principal. l. 10. cin. c. 4.

Al nations vse Sacrifice.

l. 10. c 15. 20.

Polyd. virg. l. de Inuent. rerum c. 8.

the hart of man is possessed vvith religion, true or false, but it thinketh of one Sacrifice or other. In so much that Plutarke sayth: *that a man shal sooner hit vpon cities vvithout vvalles, houses, Kings, lavves, coyne Schooles, and Theatres, then vvithout Temples and Sacrifices:* and therfore, sayth he, Epicure, vvho in deed serued no other God then his belly (and consequētly had no other Church then this kitching, no other Priests then his cookes, and no other Sacrifices then his dishes) offered notvvithstanding Sacrifice vnto the Gods, for feare of the multitude.

Aduersus Colotem.

l. quod nō potest suauiter viui secūdum Epic.

3. And as these because they had the light of nature, offered Sacrifices, but because they wanted light of faith offered them to false Gods, and vvith much superstition: so the true vvorshippers of God who vvere indewed vvith the true light of faith offered Sacrifice to the true God. Adam as I haue already proued was a Priest, and therfore did no doubt offer Sacrifice to appease Gods vvrath conceiued against his fault, although the Scripture maketh no mention of it. Abel, as the Scripture vvitnesseth, being a Priest, was not content to beare a hart ful of reuerence vnto God, but to make manifest the invvard religion of his mynd, he killed the first borne and fatest of his flocke, and offered them to God as a Sacrifice, and God respected Abel and his oblations. Noë also so soone as the fludde was falled, built an Alter vnto God, and vpon it he sacrificed and offered Holocausts, and burnt offerings of the cleane beasts, aud foules, vvhich he had preserued from the furious vvaues of that vniuersal deluge. The like did Abraham, Melchisedech, Iob and many other Patriarches, and true seruants of God vvho liued vnder the lavv of nature, as is also in the place alleaged, proued and declared. In the Lavv vvritten the vse of offering Sacrifice vvas more frequent, and the Sacrifices, and the ceremonies, vvhervvith they vvere to be offered, vvere determined by Gods ovvne mouth, as appeareth by the booke of Leuiticus and other parts of Scripture. And for this purpose especially God commanded Salomon to build that stately Temple, and would haue no Sacrifice offered but there, which is the cause why the Iewes since the destruction of their Temple, though they exercise other actes of their Religion, yet in no place dare they offer Sacrifice. Wherfore in the newe Law also, if Christ hath planted a Church, and in this Church Religion, then hath he also amongst the offices of Religion, instituted a Sacrifice.

In the first booke, &c. 6.

Gen. 4. Sacrifice in the Lavv of nature.

Gen. 8.

See the first booke, last ch. In the Lavv vvritten.

In the newe Lavv.

Isa. 53. Io. 10.

4. And this in part the Gospellers wil not let to confesse, for they grant that Christ offered his owne selfe vpon the Altar of the Crosse

as a Sa-

is a Sacrifice vnto his Father, vvhich was the complement of al the old Sacrifices, the veritie of al thoſe ſhadowes, and the price of our Redemption. But yet becauſe this Sacrifice is not ſufficient to vpholde Religion and the worſhip of God, either they muſt ſhew vs ſome other Sacrifice, or elſe they can not maintaine any true Religion. For firſt I haue proued that Religion can not ſtand vvithout a Sacrifice; vvherfore ſeing that the Sacrifice of the croſſe is paſt, and neuer to be reiterated, an other Sacrifice is neceſſarie for the continuance of Religion. Neither wil it ſuffice for an anſwer to ſay, that the effectes and vertue of the Sacrifice of the Croſſe remaine, for theſe effects are no Sacrifices, but only graces vvhich by vertue of the Sacrifice of the croſſe are beſtowed vpon vs. Much les can it ſerue for a good anſwer, to ſay that Chriſt ſtil in heauen preſenteth vnto his Father the Sacrifice of the croſſe. For that preſentation is not a true, nor a new oblation of a Sacrifice, and if it were yet becauſe it is in heauen, it is not ſufficient to vphold Religion in earth, becauſe a viſible Church and viſible worſhip of God in earth, require a viſible Sacrifice in earth. Secondly as S. Auſtin ſayth, neuer as yet did any ſocietie conſort together in one Religion but by practiſe & vſe of the ſame viſible ſignes, and Sacraments, and therfore ſeing that Sacrifice is the proper, and principal ſigne of the homage, vvhich we giue to God (becauſe it was neuer offered but to God, or at leaſt to that creature vvhich was eſteemed as God, it is impoſſible that this viſible Religion and worſhip ſhould continew without a Sacrifice and a viſible Sacrifice alſo, that to the oblation of it the people may meete together. And ſeing that the Sacrifice of the croſſe is no more viſible, and is not to be reiterated, neither is a viſible ſigne, at the which the people may mete together to worſhip therby almightie God vniformely and externally, that is not ſufficient to vphold Religion in the Church of Chriſt: for as Religion began with viſible Sacrifices, and changed with change of Sacrifices, vvhich is the cauſe why the Prophets vvhen they complaine of the fal of Religion, they complaine alſo of the fal of Sacrifices, ſo doth it continew with Sacrifices, & can not ſtand without a Sacrifice. For as in England where kneeling is a proper worſhip dew vnto the Prince, it is not ſufficient by cappe or curſye to ſhew your dutie, becauſe theſe ceremonyes are giuen to euery noble man or gentleman, yea to al thoſe alſo who beare any ſway in the common welth, and therfore to deny His Maieſtie that homage, were to deſpoile him of honour: ſo to take away Sacrifice vvhich hitherto hath bene offered

Epheſ. 5.

An other ſacrifice neceſſarie beſides that of the Croſſe.

L. 10. cont. Fauſt. c. 11.

Aug. ſup.

2. par. 15. Dan. 3. & 12.

A ſimilitude

vnto

vnto God, and neuer vnto any but such as were estemed gods, were were to robbe God of his principal and proper worship, and consequently to ruine religion: vvhich as it principally respecteth God as his proper worship, so can it not stand vvithout the same.

5. And why, I pray you, should we feare to grant a Sacrifice in the new Law? becausе (say they) Christ abrogated al Sacrifices True. I grant he abrogated al the old Sacrifices, becausе they were but shadowes, and figures of future thinges, and therfore the sunne Christ Iesus, rising in the horizon of the new Law, and the light of the veritie appearing, the darke figures, and obscure shadowes, vvere to giue place: but yet this is no argument to proue that he hath not instituted a new Sacrifice in the new Law: for so he abrogated al the old Sacraments, as Circumcision vvhich was a Sacrament only and no Sacrifice, and yet as Saint Austin sayth, he hath prescribed new Sacraments for the newv law, *Greater in vertue, better for profit, easier in vse, and fevvern number.* They wil say peraduenture that the old Sacrifices being abrogated, it is sufficient now to worship God in spirite, or at least by prayse, thankesgiuing, and such other vertuous offices. But then I must tel them that becausе stil we are composed of soule and & body, it is not sufficient that we honour God in spirit only, and becausе the Church is a visible congregation it must haue a visible Sacrifice. Neither are the external actes of vertue sufficient, becausе they (as is proued) are no true Sacrifices but only metaphorical and improper, and therfore as hitherto and in al Lawes, besids those improper Sacrifices, it was necessarie for the maintenance of Religion to haue some proper Sacrifices, such as Abel, Noë and others did offer, so in the newv lavv besides the metaphorical Sacrifices of prayer, thankesgiuing, contrite hartes and such like, we must haue some proper Sacrifice, becausе that & religion euer goe together. And if we haue no Sacrifice it foloweth that the Iewes honoured God more then we do, becausе they offered vnto him Sacrifice vvhich is the greatest honour that can be giuen, and therfore vvas alwayes reserued for God.

l. 19. *contra Faust. c. 13.*

A true and visible Sacrifice necessarie in the newv lavv.

6. A Sacrifice then is necessarie in the newv law. And vvhat more likely to be this Sacrifice then the Sacrifice of the Masse? Melchisedech and his Sacrifice were figures of Christ and his Sacrifice, as before is proued: vvherfore seing that there is no likenes betwixt Melchisedeches Sacrifice and the Sacrifice of the crosse, we must find some other in the new law vvhich doth more resemble it: and what more can resemble it then the Sacrifice of the Masse, which though it be

In the third booke chap 6. The Sacrifice of the Masse proued.

the first profe

it be not bread and wine, yet hath it the accidentes and outward shew of bread and wine. Daniel prophecying of the hauock of Religion vvhich Anti-Christ shal make, affirmeth that he shal take away the dayly Sacrifice. And what Sacrifice I pray you? not the Sacrifice of the crosse because that is past, and vvhich is doone can not be vndoone: not improper Sacrifices of prayer, contrite hartes, and such like, because he speaketh of one Sacrifice, they are many, and of a proper and publique Sacrifice, they are improper and metaphorical. He speakech therfore of some publique Sacrifice vvhich for reason of persecution shal not be offered any more in publique maner, but very secretly and not so commonly as it was wont to be. And vvhat other Sacrifice is there in the Church for Anti-Christ to take away, then that of the Masse. Let the Gospellers name it, if there be, or euer were any other. Malachie the prophet, or rather God by the mouth of his prophet, sayth that he is *vveary of the Iewes Sacrifices*, that *his vvil is not amongst them*, and that henceforth he wil *receiue no guiftes*, that is no Sacrifice, vvhich is offered by their handes but (sayth he) *From the rising of the sunne to the setting of the same, my name shalbe great amongst the gentils, and in euery place shalbe offered vnto me a cleane oblation.* And vvhat oblation or Sacrifice is that? Not the Iewish Sacrifice: because he sayth this sacrifice shal be offered amongst the gentiles, yea he protesteth that he is weary of al Iewish Sacrifices. Not the Idolatrical Sacrifices of the gentils, because he would neuer haue called them cleane Sacrifices, neither can they be said truly to be offered vnto him, but rather vnto the diuel. Not improper Sacrifices of prayer, thankes giuing, and good workes, because he compareth Sacrifice with Sacrifice, and so promising a new Sacrifice in steed of the old, as he reiecteth proper Sacrifices, so must he in lieu of them, prouide an other proper Sacrifice, which in the dignitie of a Sacrifice surpasseth them al. Yea by this *cleane Sacrifice* according vnto the reformers opinion, it is impossible that he should meane prayer, thankes-giuing, or such like good workes, because the best of these Sacrifices, in their opinion, are so vncleane that they are mortal sinnes, & abominable in the sight of God. Neither can he meane the Sacrifices which Iob & others offered amongst the gentils, because he speaketh of one Sacrifice, those were many, & could be no cleaner then those of the Iewes, yea those were offered but in few places, & so can not be the Sacrifice which Malachie sayth shal be offered in euery place euen from the East to the west. He speaketh therfore of a Sacrifice which in the new law shal be a most cleane & pleasing

The second.

This sacrifice it proued vvith Christs Priesthood in the 3. booke ch. 6.

The third.

Luth. in c. vlt. ad Gal. Cal. l. 3 inst. c. 14. l. 2. c. 5.

vnto God, and neuer vnto any but such as were estemed gods, were were to robbe God of his principal and proper worship, and consequently to ruine religion: vvhich as it principally respecteth God as his proper worship, so can it not stand vvithout the same.

5. And why, I pray you, should we feare to grant a Sacrifice in the new Law? because (say they) Christ abrogated al Sacrifices True. I grant he abrogated al the old Sacrifices, because they were but shadowes, and figures of future thinges, and therfore the sunne Christ Iesus, rising in the horizon of the new Law, and the light of the verities appearing, the darke figures, and obscure shadowes, vvere to giue place: but yet this is no argument to proue that he hath not instituted a new Sacrifice in the new Law: for so he abrogated al the old Sacraments, as Circumcision vvhich was a Sacrament only and no Sacrifice, and yet as Saint Austin sayth, he hath prescribed new Sacraments for the nevv law, *Greater in vertue, better for profit, easier in vse, and fevver in number.* They wil say peraduenture that the old Sacrifices being abrogated, it is sufficient now to worship God in spirite, or at least by prayse, thankesgiuing, and such other vertuous offices. But then I must tel them that because stil we are composed of soule and & body, it is not sufficient that we honour God in spirit only, and because the Church is a visible congregation it must haue a visible Sacrifice. Neither are the external actes of vertue sufficient, because they (as is proued) are no true Sacrifices but only metaphorical and improper, and therfore as hitherto and in al Lawes, besids those improper Sacrifices, it was necessarie for the maintenance of Religion to haue some proper Sacrifices, such as Abel, Noë and others did offer, so in the nevv lavv besides the metaphorical Sacrifices of prayer, thankesgiuing, contrite hartes and such like, we must haue some proper Sacrifice, because that & religion euer goe together. And if we haue no Sacrifice it foloweth that the Iewes honoured God more then we do, because they offered vnto him Sacrifice vvhich is the greatest honour that can be giuen, and therfore vvas alwayes reserued for God.

l. 19. *contra Faust. c.* 13.

A true and visible Sacrifice necessarie in the nevv lavv.

6. A Sacrifice then is necessarie in the nevv law. And vvhat more likely to be this Sacrifice then the Sacrifice of the Masse? Melchisedech and his Sacrifice were figures of Christ and his Sacrifice, as before is proued: vvherfore seing that there is no likenes betwixt Melchisedeches Sacrifice and the Sacrifice of the crosse, we must find some other in the new law vvhich doth more resemble it: and what more can resemble it then the Sacrifice of the Masse, which though it be

In the third booke chap 6. The Sacrifice of the Masse proued. the first prose

it be not bread and wine, yet hath it the accidentes and outward shew of bread and wine. Daniel prophecying of the hauock of Religion vvhich Anti-Christ shal make, affirmeth that he shal take away the dayly Sacrifice. And what Sacrifice I pray you? not the Sacrifice of the crosse because that is past, and vvhich is doone can not be vndoone: not improper Sacrifices of prayer, contrite hartes, and such like, because he speaketh of one Sacrifice, they are many, and of a proper and publique Sacrifice, they are improper and metaphorical. He speakech therfore of some publique Sacrifice vvhich for reason of persecution shal not be offered any more in publique maner, but very secretly and not so commonly as it was wont to be. And vvhat other Sacrifice is there in the Church for Anti-Christ to take away, then that of the Masse. Let the Gospellers name it, if there be, or euer were any other. Malachie the prophet, or rather God by the mouth of his prophet, sayth that he is *vveary of the Iewes Sacrifices*, that *his vvil is not amongst them*, and that henceforth he wil *receiue no guiftes*, that is no Sacrifice, vvhich is offered by their handes but (sayth he) *From the rising of the sunne to the setting of the same, my name shalbe great amongst the gentils, and in euery place shalbe offered vnto me a cleane oblation.* And vvhat oblation or Sacrifice is that? Not the Iewish Sacrifice: because he sayth this sacrifice shal be offered amongst the gentiles, yea he protesteth that he is weary of al Iewish Sacrifices. Not the Idolatrical Sacrifices of the gentils, because he would neuer haue called them cleane Sacrifices, neither can they be said truly to be offered vnto him, but rather vnto the diuel. Not improper Sacrifices of prayer, thankes giuing, and good workes, because he compareth Sacrifice with Sacrifice, and so promising a new Sacrifice in steed of the old, as he reiecteth proper Sacrifices, so must he in lieu of them, prouide an other proper Sacrifice, which in the dignitie of a Sacrifice surpasseth them al. Yea by this *cleane Sacrifice* according vnto the reformers opinion, it is impossible that he should meane prayer, thankes-giuing, or such like good workes, because the best of these Sacrifices, in their opinion, are so vncleane that they are mortal sinnes, & abominable in the sight of God. Neither can he meane the Sacrifices which Iob & others offered amongst the gentils, because he speaketh of one Sacrifice, those were many, & could be no cleaner then those of the Iewes, yea those were offered but in few places, & so can not be the Sacrifice which Malachie sayth shal be offered in euery place euen from the East to the west. He speaketh therfore of a Sacrifice which in the new law shal be a most cleane & pleasing

The second.

This sacrifice is proued vvith Christs Priesthood in the 3. booke ch. 6. The third.

Luth. in c. vlt. ad Gal. Cal. l. 3 inst. c. 14. l. 2. c. 5.

The Sacrifice of the Maſſe is vnbloudy: and that vvhich Malachie fortelleth

Sacrifice, & which in al partes of the Chriſtian world ſhal be offered vnto God.

7 And vvhat ſuch Sacrifice can the Reformers name, but the Sacrifice of the Maſſe? what other oblation was euer counted a Sacrifice in the Church? what other Sacrifice is offered euery vvhere, but the Sacrifice of the Maſſe, vvhich is a moſt cleane Sacrifice, not only in reſpect of the outward forme, vvhich is vnblouddy, but alſo in reſpect of the moſt chaſt, pure, and virginal fleſh & bloud of Chriſt, vvhich it conteineth? and this is the Sacrifice vvhich Chriſt offered at his laſt ſupper, vvhen taking bread and vvine into his handes he *bleſſed* them, and by bleſſing, turning them into his ſacred body and bloud, he told his diſciples that it was his body and bloud vvhich he *gaue for them*. In vvhich vvordes he can meane no other thing then the Sacrifice of his body and bloud, vvhich he offered vnder the formes of bread and wine. For to gloſſe thoſe vvordes as Caluin doth (as though Chriſt had ſayd: *This is my body*, that is, this is a figure of my body, vvhich ſhal be geuen for you) is very violent and repugnant to the text, becauſe the greeke text vſeth the preſentence *Which is geuen for you, vvhich is povvred out for you*: and therfore vnderſtandeth ſome thing vvhich euen then was geuen for them. And ſeing that Caluins bread & figure could only be ſaid to be geuen to them, but not for them, that vvhich then he gaue for them, was his body & bloud, which vnder the forme of bread and vvine he offered for them. And ſeing that he bad his Apoſtles to do as he had done, that is, to offer the ſame Sacrifice vvhich he did, for ſo much the latin word (*facite*) in that place and vvith ſuch circumſtances importeth, it muſt needes folow, that he cōmanded the Apoſtles, & in them their ſucceſſors, to offer Sacrifice, & the ſame Sacrifice vvhich he offered for his Apoſtles at his laſt ſupper, vvhich is the Sacrifice of the Maſſe. This veritie I could proue more largely by other circūſtances of this place, eſpecially according to the greeke, and I could alleage that place of S. Paul, vvhere he compareth table to table, that is Altar to Altar ſaying *that vve can not be partakers of the table of our Lord and of the diuel*: that is, we can not participate of that which is offered on the Altars of the gentiles, & of that alſo which is offered on the Chriſtians Altar, and out of this place I could proue that in S. Paules time there was ſome thing offered on the Chriſtians Altars, which he oppoſeth to that which was offered on the Paganes Altars. I could alſo preſſe our aduerſaries and oppreſſe them with the authoritie and multitude of Fathers, who al acknovvledge that Chriſt at his laſt ſup-

It is proued by Chriſts vvordes.

Mat. 26.

Luc. 22.

Mar. 16.

1. Cor. 11.

Mat. 26.

Luc. 22.

Heb. 13.

Hier. ep. ad Marcellam. Aug. l. 16. ciuit. c. 22. l. 1. cont. aduer

last supper offered a Sacrifice of his owne body and bloud, vnder the forme of bread and vvine, and that therby he was a Priest according to the order of Melchisedech: but this veritie I haue partly proued already in prouing Christ to be an æternal Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, partly I shal herafter proue, when in the last booke vpon occasion I shal demonstrate the real presence of Christs body and bloud in the Sacrament of the Altar. And as for the Fathers authoritie, it were but lost labour to alleage it for any proofe of this veritie, becaus Luther hath already debarred vs from such proofes, and vvil tel vs plainly that they are not to be credited in this matter, because they were but men. And Caluin also wil tel me, that seing this supper is the supper of the Lord, there is no reason why we should be moued with any auctoritie of men or prescription of yeares. VVherfore let them cary away the bucklers, let them be credited before practise of the Church, which alwayes offered Sacrifice; before reason, which telleth vs that Religion can not stand without a Sacrifice; before the plaine text of Scripture, which in plaine words affirmeth that Christ gaue his body and powred out his bloud at his last supper for his disciples, vvhich vvords can import no lesse then a Sacrifice; before al Fathers also, because they were but men and our reformers as it semeth are godds: let them gaine the gole and gette the victoritie in this controuersie: vvhat shal they gaine therby? truly only this: that amongst them is no Religion.

sarium legis c. 20. Damasc. l. 4. de fide c. 14. Theoph. in 5. Heb. Arnob. in psal. 109. l. de abrog. Missæ. l. 4. Inst. c. 18. par. 10. vt supra.

8. For if they haue no Sacrifice, as they confesse that they haue not, and in dede they haue not: and if Sacrifice, as being the principal office of Religion and proper vnto God, as is proued, is necessarily required, that without it Religion can in no wise be supported: the conclusion to which my former discourse driueth, must needs folowe, that the reformers haue no Religion, because no Sacrifice no Religion: And seing that in the Catholique and Romain Church only is found a Sacrifice like to Melchisedechs, and correspondent to that of which Daniel and Malachie haue fortold, as the Sacrifice of the nevv Lavv, and the same which Christ offered at his last supper, and commanded to be offered by his Apostles and their successors, it foloweth that the Catholique Church is the true Church of Christ, and that in it only is practised true Faith and true Religion.

The third Chapter shewveth hovv the reformers amongst them haue reiected al the Sacraments, and so can haue no Religion, becauſe Sacraments and Religion euer goe together.

Sacramentes neceſſarie in reſpect of our dutie to God.

IT is a common opinion amongſt the holy Fathers and Diuines that ſince the fal of Adam, Sacramentes were alwayes neceſſary, partly to declare mans duty towards God, and partly for mans owne inſtruction. For firſt man being compoſed of ſoule and body, was to ſerue God, not only with inward affections, but alſo by outward and viſible ſignes. Secondly becauſe he was to receiue grace from Chriſt againſt the maladie of ſinne, into vvhich he was fallen, he was alſo to profeſſe his fayth in Chriſt, from vvhom this grace procedeth, & to acknowledge it as deſcending from his Paſſion, by viſible ſignes and figures: ſuch as Abels Sacrifice, and Circumciſion were in the law of nature, and ſuch as the Paſchal lambe, and other Sacraments were in the law of Moyſes, and ſuch as Baptiſme, and the Sacrament of the Altar are in the law of grace. Thirdly becauſe he had offended God by vſe of corporal thinges, it was conuenient that by corporal and ſenſible Sacramentes, & by the religious vſe of the ſame, he ſhould reſtore to God, his honour which ſinne had taken from him, and make him ſatisfaction by ſuch thinges as he had done him iniurie.

The firſt reaſon hereof.

The ſecond.

The third.

Sacraments neceſſarie in reſpect of mãs owne ſelf.

2. For mans behalfe alſo, Sacraments ſince Adams ſinne, were alwayes requiſite. For firſt, becauſe mans ſinne proceded of pride, and a deſire to be like to God in knowledge of good and euil, it was conuenient for mans humiliation that he ſhould be ſet to Schoole, to learne not only of the Ant, diligence, and of other brute beaſtes, other vertues, but alſo of theſe ſenſeles creatures, ſuch as Sacraments are, his faith and religion. Wherfore as the Paſchal lambe brought the Iewes into a grateful remembrance of their deliuerie and paſſage from Egipte, and Circumciſion did put them in mynd of a ſpiritual Circumciſion: So Baptiſme ſetteth before our eyes the burial and Reſurrection of Chriſt. For vvhen the infant is dipped into the water, vve thinke of Chriſtes burial, and vvhen he is lifted vp a new creature re-

Gen 3.

The firſt reaſõ Prou. 6.

Rom. 6.

genera-

generated to a newe life, we cal to mynd the Resurrection, by vvhich Christ is risen to a new and an immortal life. And in the Sacred Eucharist vvhich by the forme and accidentes of bread and wine, representeth the bodie and bloud of Christ, as separated apart, we commemorate the death and Passion of Christ. Secondly as man by sinne had preferred the creature before the Creator, so was it mete and conuenient, that he should as it were begge grace and seeke his saluation by the meanes of these sensible signes and Sacraments, vvhich are farre inferior vnto him in nature. Lastly as by abuse of corporal creatures he had wounded his soule by sinne, so was it expedient that by vse of the same, his diseases and spiritual sores should be recured. And so it was most requisite that Christ in the new Law should institute sensible signes and Sacraments. And therfore S. Austin sayth that as yet neuer any societie could ioyne in one religion and worship of God, but by the vse of the same Sacramentes. In vvhich point the reformers agree whith vs, for they al auouch (Suenkfeldius only excepted and some other Libertines) that Sacramentes are necessarie, but in the number they vary, not only from the Catholiques but also one from an other.

Mat 26.
The second.
The third.
l. 10. cont. Faust. c. 10.

3. The Catholique Church hath euer vsed seauen Sacramentes, vvhich are, Baptisme, Confirmation, the Sacrament of the Altar, Penance, Order, Mariage, and Extreme vnction. Which number S. Thomas the Diuine explaineth by a very pregnāt reason, or rather similitude, vvhich is betwixt the corporal and spiritual life of man. For in our corporal life, seuen thinges are required to vvhich are correspondent seuen Sacraments in the spiritual life of man. In a corporal life first is necessary generation, vvhich giueth the first being and essence: and to this is answerable Baptisme, which regenerateth vs againe to a new life and spiritual being of a Christian, by vvhich we are new creatures, borne of water and the Spirit, vnto a new life. Wherfore Tertulian calleth Christians spiritual fishes, because though they haue their corporal life from earth by carnal generation, yet their spiritual life and being, like fishes, they receiue from the water, by spiritual regeneration. Secondly in a corporal life is necessarie augmentation by vvhich the litle infant (for al beginnings are litle) waxeth, groweth, and gaineth dew proportion, quantitie and strength, by vvhich he is able to exercise operation and actions belonging to corporal life, as to eate, drinke, talke, walke, labour, to defend him selfe, and to assault his enemie. And to this is correspondent the Sacrament of Con-

Seuen Sacraments.
3 p. q. 65. a. 1.
A pregnant proofe for 7. Sacramēts by the similitude vvhich is betvvixt a corporal and spiritual life.
Baptisme is our generatiō.

Confirmation is our augmẽtation.

firmation, vvhich perfiteth vs in the ſpiritual life receiued in Baptiſme (vvhich is the cauſe why ſome Fathers ſay, that before this Sacrament we are not perfect Chriſtians) and giueth vs force to defend this our ſpiritual life by confeſſing our fayth before the perſecutor, vvhich faith is the ground of ſpiritual life. Thirdy becauſe this corporal life of ours fadeth and miniſheth continually (for euery houre we loſe ſome part of our ſubſtance, partly by reaſon of the conflict of the contrarie elements which conſume vs whileſt in vs they ſtriue one againſt an other, partly by reaſon of the continual combate vvhich is betwixt natural heate and moyſture, vvhich is as it were the tallowe of our light and liſe (we ſtand in nede of nurriture and nutrition, which reſtoreth that ſubſtance vvhich is dayly loſt, and ſo prolongeth our life. And to this in our ſpiritual life anſwereth the Sacrament of the Altar, vvhich conteining in it the body and bloud of Chriſt (vvho calleth him ſelfe *liuing bread* and ſayth that: *his fleſh is truly meate, and his bloud truly drinke*) nouriſheth the ſoule ſpiritually, and conſerueth our ſpiritual life here, and prepareth vs to an immortal life in heauen. Fourthly man hauing a mortal life ſubiect to ſicknes and diſeaſes, vvhich partly come by diſorder in dyet, partly by extrinſecal operation of the Starres, ayre, and wether, to vvhich our bodyes are ſubiect, partly do procede from the complexion and cõſtitution of mans body vvhich is compoſed of contraries: it was neceſſary for preſeruation of corpotal life that God ſhould prouide vs of Phiſitians and corporal Phiſick, vvhich reſtoreth vs to health after ſicknes. In like maner our ſpiritual life vvhich is grace, in this life being not ſo ſtable but that it may be loſt many tymes by mortal ſinne, and our health being not as yet ſo confirmed, but that we may fal into as many diſeaſes, as by our frie wil we may commit ſinnes, it was not only expedient but alſo neceſſary, that Chriſt our ſpiritual Phiſitian ſhould prouide vs of Phiſicke, and of a general ſalue, and medecin, againſt al the ſores and maladies of our ſoules. And this is the Sacrament of Penance, vvhich is a remedie againſt ſinne committed after Baptiſme, & vvhich by the Prieſt our ſpiritual Phiſitian, is to be applyed vnto vs. For to him as being ſucceſſor to the Apoſtles, Chriſt gaue this power and authoritie vvhen he ſayd to his Apoſtles: *Vvhoſe ſinnes you forgiue are forgiuen.* Wherfore S. Chriſoſtom ſayth, that the Prieſts of the new law haue power not only to giue ſentence, whether we be infected with the leprie of ſinne or no (which authoritie only the Prieſts of the old law had concerning the corporal lepreſie) but alſo to cure, clenſe, and purge this

the Eucharift our nutrimẽt.

Ioh. 6.

1. Tim. 1.

1. Cor. 10.

Apoc. 2.

Penence is our Phiſicke.

Iohn. 20.

l. 1. de Sacerd.

leprie

leptie. Fiftly vvhen man is recured, often tymes there remaine the reliques of his diſeaſes, vvhich kepe him low a great while, and therfore he yet nedeth Phiſick not ſo much for healing as confirming, and perfiting health, vvhich conſiſteth in ſome confortatiues or reſtauratiues. The like happeneth vnto man, after that by the Sacrament of Penance he is recured: for after that, he ſtil hath a kinde of weaknes and infirmitie, and euil habits and inclinations, yea litle diſeaſes alſo ſuch as venial ſinnes are. And therfore againſt theſe Reliques of his diſeaſe, Chriſt hath prouided him the Sacrament of Extreme vnction, which is giuē at the houre of death to purge vs cleane from al reliques of our diſeaſes, to recure the corporal infirmitie if it be expedient for ſaluation, and to prepare vs to a better health of the next life, vvhich is immortalitie. And theſe fiue things are requiſit in a corporal and ſpiritual life, for euery man in particular, but beſides them, two things alſo are neceſſary for the communitie.

Extreme Vnctiō is againſt relikes of our ſpiritual diſeaſes.

4. The firſt is coniunction of man and woman, without which mankind can neither be propagated nor preſerued, and to make their coninnction lawful, Matrimony was euer neceſſarie. And to this in the new Law which is a Law of grace, the Sacrament of Matrimonie anſvvereth very fitly, vvhich before Chriſt, was a ciuil contract but no Sacrament, as now it is. For now as S. Paul ſayth, *it is a great Sacrament*, in that it ſignifieth the coniunction of Chriſt with his Church, by Incarnation and grace, & giueth grace vnto the maryed, by which they may loue one an other as Chriſt did his Church, & beare the burdens of vvedlocke more eaſily. The ſecond thing is conſtitution of Princes, Gouernors or Magiſtrats to rule this humaine ſocietie, which Matrimonye hath propagated. For if the confuſed multitude were left to it ſelfe, and had not ſome head to gouerne it, it would like a ſhip without a Pilot, or a body without a head, by mutual diſſenſion and diſorder of members ſoone ruinate it ſelfe. To this is anſwerable the Sacrament of Order, by which Biſhops & Prieſts are ordained to miniſter Sacraments, to offer Sacrifice, to teach, preach, and inſtruct, and by Lawes and cenſures to gouerne this multitude, and to direct it in thoſe thinges, which concerne good life, ſpiritual peace, and Religion here, and life euerlaſting herafter. The ſeuen Sacraments are thoſe ſeuen pillers, vvhich as the vviſeman ſayth, vviſdome it ſelfe Chriſt IESVS hath made to ſupport the huge pallace of his Church. And the ſeuen tymes ſprinkling of the bloud of the calfe, prefigured theſe ſeuen Sacraments, in which the bloud of Chriſt is as it were ſeuen tymes

Propagation of mankinde neceſſarie.

To that ane ſvvereth th Sacrament of Matrimonie. Eph. 5.

Superioritie neceſſarie in a cōmon vvelth. to this anſvvereth Prieſthod and Order.

Prou. 9.

Leuit. 4. Figures of 7. Sacraments

4. Reg. 5. uen tymes ſprinkled, becauſe it giueth them their force, vertue, and efficacie. Yea Naamans ſeuen waſhings were a figure of the ſame Sacramentes, in which the ſoule of man is ſeuen tymes waſhed, and ſo fried from the lepreſie of ſinne.

5. But theſe are but congruences (ſayth our aduerſarie) let vs ſee the plaine word of God for ſeuen Sacramentes, elſe we are not to admitte them. I grant that theſe are not plaine demonſtrations, becauſe as Diuines ſay *matters of fact can not be dēmonſtrated*, but yet are they better argumentes, then they can bring for their leſſer number of Sacramentes. I could alleage alſo Fathers for euery one of the Sacramentes before named: but they vvil ſay that Fathers are men. And are not our aduerſaries alſo men? yes ſay they, but vve præferre the vvord of God before mens traditions. But then I aske of them, what expreſſe worde of God they haue againſt theſe men? The Fathers auouch ſeuen Sacraments: where read they in Scripture that there are but tvvo, or three? We haue no ſuch number expreſſely named (ſay they) but we gather by good conſequence out of Scripture that there are but tvvo or three. Do you ſo? And did not the Fathers out of Scripture deduce ſeuen Sacraments? For although they neuer ſay that there are iuſt ſeuen, yet ſometimes they name one, ſometimes tvvo, ſometimes moe, and amongſt them al they haue giuen teſtimonie for euery one of the ſeuen Sacraments in particular, and none at al deny ſeuen. Yea for theſe 500. yeares al the Diuines haue defended ſeuen Sacraments, who alſo neuer mentioned this number as any new Article of beleefe, but accepting it from their forfathers, haue approued and defended it, and by Scriptures alſo do confirme it. Yea the Councels of Florence and Trent haue auouched the ſame number, and thought them ſelues backed herin by authoritie of Scripture. But they were al deceiued ſayth our aduerſarie. Were they ſo? And how can you warrant vs that you in denying ſeuen Sacraments are not deceiued? If you ſay that you deduce your two or three Sacraments out of Scripture, they vvil ſay that they alſo out of Scripture deduce their ſeuen. And ſo the queſtion is not whether Scriptures or Fathers are to be beleeued, but whether the Church, Councels, and Fathers, vvho proue ſeuen Sacraments out of Scripture, are to be credited in the expoſition of Scripture, or rather your new bibliſts who began to ſtudie but yeſter day, and neuer ſtudied ſo many dayes as they haue done dayes and nightes, who alſo neither for grauitie nor ſanctitie, neither for wit nor learning, were vvorthy to cary their bookes after them. But leſt our aduerſarie triumphe

Scholaſtici in 4. diſt. 2.

Con. Flor in decreto. Trid. Seſs. 7. can. 1.

triumphe that we can not proue our Sacraments by Scripture, I vvil bring Scriptures for euery one of them.

6 But first I must agree with them vpon certaine conditions. For first of al they must not exact of me to proue that these seuen are expressely called by the name of Sacraments: for so they can not proue their two or three Sacraments, because Matrimonie only) vvhich yet they deny to be a Sacrament) is expresly called a Sacrament. Secondly they must not demand of me any place of Scripture, vvhich sayth that there are seuen Sacraments, because they can alleage no such place vvhich sayth that there are not seuen, or that there are but two or three. And the reason is because Scripture vseth to treate of many thinges, but not alwayes to number them: For Scripture relateth Christs miracles, & yet numbereth them not, and it setteth downe many articles of faith, as the Trinitie, Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and many others, yet neuer setteth downe any certaine number. They must be content then that I deduce by as good consequence out of Scripture that there are seuen Sacramentes as they can gather their two or three Sacramentes. And this I can do, and if this I do, I shal refute al their opinions of vvhich some hold one, only, some two, some three, some foure and al conspire in the denial of seuen.

Conditions to be agreede vpon the first. *Ephes. 5.* *The second.*

7 But before I do this, I must suppose vvhich they wil grant, and can not deny, vnles they wil deny al Sacraments, that to proue seuen Sacraments out of Scripture, shal be sufficient if I can find in Scripture either in expresse termes, or by good deduction, an external rite, commandment or Institution, and a promise of grace in euery one of the seuen Sacramẽts afore named. For by those our aduersaries proue their Sacraments, and because they imagin that some of these conditions requisite to a Sacrament, are deficient in some of the seuen, they deny them to be Sacraments. Wherfore in the Apologie of their confession these vvordes are to be sene: *If vve cal Sacraments, rits, vvhich haue a commandment from God, and to vvhich is annexed a promise of grace, it is easie to iudge, vvhich are properly Sacraments.* And a litle after by this rule they gather that Baptisme, the Supper, and Penance are Sacraments.

VVhat is requisite to a Sacrament.

8 To begin therfore with Baptisme: the external rite we gather out of the third of. Ihon, and the last of S. Matthew, vvhich is water and vvashing, the commandment and Institution is proued out of these wordes *vnles a man be regenerated of vvater and the Holy Ghost:* The promise of grace hwich is annexed to this Sacramẽt, the last chapter of

Baptisme proued to be a Sacrament. *Io. 8.*

Mat. 16. S. Marke proposeth in those words: *he that beleueth and shal be baptized shal be saued.* And to go on with the Sacrament of the Altar, the external rite of this Sacrament is bread and vvine., or the formes of bread & wine. The institution and commandement is contained in the words: *Doe this in commemoration of me.* The promise of grace we gather out of S. Iohn *he vvho eateth this bread shal liue for euer.* In Confirmation also vve find an external rite, vvhich is imposition of handes, by vvhich the Apostles, and Apostles and Bishops only, vsed after Baptisme, to giue the Holy Ghost. The promise of grace appeareth by the performance, because al they vpon whom the Apostles layd their handes, receiued the Holy Ghost, and consequently grace. The institution and commandment we may vvel presume to haue proceded from Christ, because Apostles can not institute Sacramentes, nor cause any external ceremonie to giue the Holy Ghost infallibly, and they vvould neuer haue presumed such a thing, without commandement from Christ their maister. Wherfore S. Austin speaking of this Sacrament sayth in plaine termes, *that the Sacrament of Chrisme, is to be numbered amongst the sacred signes, euen as Baptisme is.* The same conditions of a Sacrament, are easily to be found also in the Sacrament of Confession: for Christ sayth vnto his Apostles and in them to al their successors: *VVhose sinnes you shal forgiue, are forgiuen them, and vvhose sinnes you shal retaine, are retained.* In vvhich vvordes he giueth authoritie to Priests as his vnder Iudges, to absolue from sinnes and to detaine sinnes, and because the Priest can not absolue vnles the penitent confesse his sinnes, and the penitent can not know that he is absolued, vnles the Priest pronounce some audible sentence, we gather that the external rite of this Sacrament is an audible confession and absolution, the promise of grace is found also in this Sacrament most euidently, because Christ promiseth that whose sinnes the Priest forgiueth shal be forgiuen, and seing that sinnes can not be forgiuen without grace, if the Priest can forgiue sinnes, he can also giue grace by this Sacrament. The institution and commandement is contained in the same vvords, because Priestes haue commission from Christ to absolue from sinnes, and to hold and detaine our sinnes, and consequently sinners vvho must reconcile themselues to God must do it by confession to the Priest, else can not he absolue, for no iudge can giue sentence vvithout knovvledge of the cause, and othervvise he can not be sayed to detaine our sinnes, for if he detaine our sinnes vve can not be looſed but by his absolution, and seing that al sinners must seeke to frie them selues from the bandes &

bondage

The Sacramẽt of the Altar a Sacrament.
Mat. 26.
1. Cor. 15.
Io. 6.
Confirmation a Sacrament.
Act. 8. 19.
Dionis. l. eccl. Hier. p. 3. c. 2.
Tert. l. de res. carnis & lib. de baptis.
Cip. l. 1. ep 12.
Aug l. 2. cont lit. Pre c. 384.
Supra.
Confession a Sacrament.
Io. 29.
Amb. l. 1. de pon. ca. 7.
Aug. l. 5. de Bap. s. 20.

bondage of sinne, they must come to the Priest, who only vnder God, bindeth and looseth. In the Sacrament of Order vve find also an external rite, to wit imposition of handes, which in Greeke is called *Chirotonia*, vvhich as S. Hierom sayth signifieth ordination of Clerkes. The commandement and institution we gather thus: S. Paul biddeth Timothie not to neglect the grace which he had receiued by imposition of hands, wherfore S. Paul knew that infallibly that external rite gaue grace: but it could not giue grace if Christ had not instituted it to that end, and S. Paul vvould not haue præsumed to haue vsed it to that end if Christ had not commanded and instituted it, *Ergo* this external rite vvas instituted and commanded. The promise of grace we gather by the performance, because S. Paul sayth that Timothie had receiued grace by imposition of hands. That Matrimonie also is a Sacrament S. Paul wil vvitnesse, who because this semed most vnlike a Sacrament or holy signe, calleth it a great Sacrament, because it signifieth the coniunction of Christ vvith his Church. As if he had sayd: Matrimonie to a wordly eye may seme to haue litle sanctitie or mysterie in it, but I say that in this respect that it signifieth the Mariage of Christ whith his Church, it is a Sacrament and a great Sacrament. The external rite of this Sacrament is the contract which by words or signes is made betwixt man and wife, & therfore S. Chrisostom & S. Hierom vpon this place affirme that S. Paul called this contract, a great Sacrament. The Institution we haue in Christs ovvne words: *vvhat God hath conioined let not man separate.* The promise of grace thus we gather: because Christ hath made this Sacrament indissoluble, and consequently he must giue grace by it to beare the burden of perpetual wedlocke easily, else had the Law of Matrimonie presled more heauilie the necks of Christians then the Law of the Iewes, because they in case of fornication might leaue their old wife, and take a new, and so shake of the burden. Secondly S. Paul sayth that this Sacrament signifieth the Mariage of Christ with his Church, which Mariage was made not only by Incarnation, but also by grace, and therfore the Church is called Christs louing spouse, and S. Paul biddeth men to loue their wiues as Christ loued his Church. Wherfore vnles we wil say that Matrimonie is an idle signe, we must say that it hath a promise of grace annexed, by which man and wife may loue one an other, and beare also more easily the heauy burden of Mariage. Wherfore S. Austin sayth: *in the mariages of Christians, the sanctitie of the Sacrament is of more valevv then the frutefulnes of the vvombe.* Last of al, that

Order a Sacrament. 1. *Tim.* 4. 2. *Tim.* 1. *Supra.* *Aug. l.* 2. *cõt. ep. Parm. c.* 13. *l* 1. *de bap. c.* 1. *Ephes.* 5. *Matrimonie a Sacrament.* *Mat.* 19. 2. *Cor.* 10. *l de bono coniug. c.* 19. *vide etiam cap.* 24.

Extreme vnction is also a Sacrament, it is plaine by the vvords of S. Iames: *Is any sicke amongst you? let him bring in the Priests of the Church, and let them pray vpon him, anointing him vvith oyle in the name of our Lord, and the prayer of fayth shal saue the sick man, and our Lord shal alleuiate him, and if he be in sinnes, they shal be forgiuen him.* In vvhich vvords who seeth not the external rite, to vvit prayer, that is the forme of vvordes vsed in this Sacrament, & the anointing with oile? The promise is alleuiation and forgiuenes of sinnes, which are neuer remitted without grace. The institution and commandment is easily deduced: because an Apostle who may promulgate & minister Sacramétes, but not institute them, would neuer haue so bouldly promised forgiuenes of sinnes by an external rite and ceremonies, had he not bene assured that Christ had instituted it to that effect. VVherfore S. Bernard in the life of S. Malachias affirmeth, that he *anointed a vvhoman, knovving that in this Sacrament sinnes are forgiuen.* And thus much for proofe of seuen Sacraments. Novv let vs see vvhat Sacramentes the reformers haue.

cap. 5. Extreme vnction a Sacrament.

Ber. in vita Mal. Innocentius ep. 1. ad Decentium c. 8.

9. Luther very peremptorily auoucheth that *he must deny seuen Sacramentes, & alovv of three only for the tyme.* He sayth for the tyme, because he was not sure how long he should remaine in that mynd. And what are those three Sacramentes which for a tyme he is content to allovv vs; *Baptisme* (sayth he) *Penance, and Bread.* Zuinglius aloweth also of three, but not the same vvhich his Maister Luther admitteth, vvhich are Baptisme, the Supper, and Matrimonie. Calain admitteth also thre Sacraments, but not the same vvhich Zuinglius granteth, Baptisme, the Supper, and Ordination. Melancton is more liberal for he affordeth vs foure, to wit, Baptisme, the Supper, Penance, and Order. The softer Lutherans in their conuenticle at Lipsia, alowed of seuen Sacraments, for so Sleidan the Historiographer, relateth.

l. de cap. Bab. Disagreemēt of heretikes about the nūber of Sacramēts. l. de vera & falsa rel. c. de matr. l. 4. Inst. 6. c. 19. 32. Mol. in locis. l. 20. hist. an. 48

10 Out of this diuersitie of opinions I gather, first that they haue amongst them denyed almost al the Sacraments; and so can haue no Religion, or a verie graceles Religion, because Religion and Sacraments euer went together. Secondly I gather that if any man wil forsake the Catholique Church and her beleefe of seuen Sacraments, that he hath no moral nor probable assurance of any Sacramentes, for seing that he hath no more reason to credit Luther when he sayd once that there was but one Sacrament, another tyme that there were but two Sacramentes, then when he admitted three for the tyme, he is not to credit him at al. And seing that he can alleage nō more for him selfe then others (that is Scripture interpreted as he pleaseth) and they

Collectiōs the first. The second. l. de cap. Bab. initio. in fine

no more

no more then he, no man can haue iuſt cauſe to beleeue any of them, and ſo if he leaue the Catholique Church, he may doubt of al the Sacramentes. Laſtly ſeing that the reformers can not bring expreſſe Scripture for any of the Sacramẽtes but Matrimonie, which not with ſtanding almoſt al of them deny, and ſeing that by deduction (as I haue declared) we may gather out of Scripture as probably ſeuen Sacramentes, as one, though the reformers leaue the authoritie of the Church and Fathers, and truſt only to their owne wittes in gathering by deduction, and conſequence, their Sacramentes out of Scripture, then as one diſtruſteth an others deduction, ſo may he diſtruſt his owne, and ſo they haue no certaintie of any Sacramentes at al, and conſequently haue no probable aſſurance of their Religion, becauſe Sacramentes and Religion go together: vvhich Luther him ſelfe vvil confeſſe, who affirmeth, that conſent in doctrin of the Sacramentes, is a note of the true Church and Religion. *The laſt.* *l. de not. Bab.*

The fourth Chapter shevveth of vvhat litle importance they make the Sacraments to be.

THE reformers, as by the former chapter appeareth, are very ſparing in their Sacramentes, ſome and the moſt of them not affording vs aboue two or three, but theſe alſo they ſeme to grant vs with an euil wil, becauſe they ſo detract from their dignitie, and attribute ſo litle vnto them, that they might as wel with Suenkfeldius haue denyed theſe alſo, becauſe as good neuer a whit as neuer the better.

2. For they deny with common voice, that Sacramẽtes giue grace, or effectuate any iotte of ſanctification in our ſoules. To vvhat purpoſe then ſerue they, or vvhat neceſſitie was there of them? Melancthon ſayth that they ſerue for badges to diſtinguiſh vs from Infidels. But for this effect we neded no Sacraments at al, becauſe the yelow cap of the Iew in Rome, or ſome noble mans cogniſance would haue bene more fitting for this purpoſe. For ſeing that Baptiſme according to Melancthons opinion giueth no caracter, after the childe is waſhed in baptiſme, and the water dryed vp, vvhat ſigne remaineth I pray you to diſtin-

Hovv heretikes detract. from Sacraments. *l. de loc. c. de ſignis.* *Melancthons opinion of them.*

to distinguish a Christian from an infidel? And wil not profession of our fayth, vvhich is no Sacrament, distinguish vs better? Zuinglius maketh Sacramentes no better then souldioars markes, by vvhich they are admitted and distinguished, but this is refuted by the same argument by vvhich we haue reiected Melancthons badges. Luther granteth a litle more vnto Sacramentes: for he sayth that Sacramentes are external signes, ordained to no other purpose then to stirre vp fayth vvhich only iustifieth, and therfore vvhen he & his Lutheranes sometymes saye that Sacramentes do sanctifie vs, and that baptisme doth regenerate vs, they meane not as Catholiques do that Sacramentes immediately giue vs grace, but only that they stirr vp faith vvhich sanctifieth: wherfore somtymes they cal Sacraments pictures vvhich put vs in mind of Christ & his Passion. But then it foloweth that they who haue pictures of Christ or his Passion, or bookes of the same subiect, stand in nede of no Sacraments, becaus these thinges are more apte to stirre vp faith then sacraments. Secondly Baptisme is to no purpose in children, becaus it can not stirre vp their faith at al, who haue no vse of reason at al:

l. de vera & falsa rel. c. de Sacramentis.
Bucers opinio.
l. capt. Bab. c. de bap c. vl.
Luthers liberalitie.

3 This so presseth Luther that it had made him an Anabaptist, had he not had a shift in store vvhich also is a very pore one. He sayth therfore that infants at the time of Baptisme haue vse of reason, and that they vnderstand what Baptisme signifieth, & so beleue also in Christ. And this he proueth by the example of S. Iohn Baptist who reioyced and acknowleged Christ in his mothers wombe: but by the same argument he might haue proued that al asses can speake, becaus Balaams Asse by miracle once spake to the Prophet. For as it was a priuiledge that S. Iohn had vse of reason in his mothers wombe, so was it that Balaams Asse did speake, and therfore if this be a good argument: S. Ihon had vse of reason, when he was an infant *Ergo* al childrē haue: this also is a good argument: Balaams Asse could speake *ergo* al asses can speake. At leastwise by this argument of Luther, we may experience in him, vvhat an asse can speake, and is not ashamed to vtter. And truly if children at that age were as wise as Luther wil make them, we must condemne them of hainous sacriledge who by their crying, and resistance vvhich such litle ones can make, shew how vnwillingly and with what litle respect they receiue this sacrament. Caluin sayth that Sacramentes are but seales vvhich outwardly signe the grace, vvhich we receiue by the promise of God, and therfore he sayth flatly: that Sacramentes giue no grace and that the Sacramentes of the new lawe

Luth. pressed. l. cont. Coclenum.
Luc. 1.
Num. 22.
Aug. ep. 57.
l. 4. Inst. c. 14. 1. 5. 14.
Caluins opinion.

are

are no better in this respecte, then were the Sacramentes of the old law. Yea he addeth that as S. Paul sayed, that Circumcision is nothing, so he might haue sayd, that Baptisme in this respect is nothing vvorth. *1. Cor. 5.*

4 And their reasons vvhy they wil giue no vertue vnto Sacramentes are two especially. Firſt say they if we grant that Sacramentes giue grace, then foloweth it, that we must put our trust in Sarcamentes, and seke for saluation elsewhere, then at the handes of Christ, vvhich can not but derogate much from the Passion and Person of Christ. But this reason semeth to haue litle reason. For as the sicke patient principally after God, putteth his trust in his Phisitian, yet expecteth health also by the medicins vvhich he prescribeth, and so putteth his trust in the Phisitian as in the principal causes of his health, and in the instrumental causes, and yet doth no iniurie to the Phisitian, yea rather in allowing of his medicins doth him great honour: so may we put our hope and confidence principally in Christ as our spiritual Phisitian, and yet hope also for health by the Sacramentes, as by his medicins and instrumental causes of spiritual health. Secondly they are of opinion as shal be herafter related and refuted, that only Fayth iustifieth,: wherfore they must consequently say that Sacramentes giue no grace, they should also iustifie and sanctifie, and so only Faith should not iustifie. And so folovving this doctrin some of them say that Sacraments are only badges to make vs knovvne to be Christians, others say they only stirre vp faith; others make them seales and signes of former iustice, and al deny that they sanctifie vs.

The first reason, vvhy they deny that Sacraments giue grace.

The second reason

5 Against al these opinions might suffice that place of S. Paul, vvhere to put a difference betwixt our Sacraments and the old, he calleth the old, naked elements, that is bare figures and of no force nor vertue to giue grace. But we vvant not many other places of Scripture vvhich may also proue this veritie. S. Ihon sayth that if a man be not regenerated of water and the Holy Ghost, he can not enter inro heauen, *ergo* not only the Holy Ghost, but vvater also regenerateth, and consequently not only the Holy Ghost as a principal Agent, but also the water as an instrument, vvorketh grace in vs by vvhich we are regenerated. The Sacrament of the Altar Christ him selfe calleth true meate vvhich geueth life and nourisheth. The Sacrament of Penance remitteth sinnes, because Christ geueth power to his Apostles, and in them to their successors to remit sinnes: by the sentence of absolution. And S. Paul wil vvitnes that Order geueth grace to Priests, and

Gal 4. Sacraments giue grace. *Io. 8.* *Io. 6.* *Io. 22.* *1. Tim. 4.* *2. Tim. 1.* *4. 8. 19.*

Act. 8. 19. and the actes of the Apostles auouch, that the Apostles when they confirmed the first Christians, gaue the Holy Ghost by imposition of handes. The like proofes I could bring and haue before brought in the former chapter for the other Sacramentes. But be it so that Sacramentes giue no grace, then doth it folow that they are to no purpose, because other thinges we haue more fitte to distinguish Christians from Infidels, and to stirre vp fayth, which are by our aduersaries opinion, the only effectes of Sacramentes: and so it foloweth that if Sacramentes giue no grace, that they are of no vertue and altogether superfluous, and so as good it were to haue no Sacramentes as Sacramentes, because as good neuer a whit as neuer the better: and no Sacramentes no Religion, because as before, Sacramentes and Religion euer went together.

The conclusion.

The fift Chapter sheweth how in effect the reformers take away from vs those fewe Sacramentes which they seme to alowe of.

Heretikes liberalitie. OVR Reformers are so liberal as to afforde vs two Sacramentes, to wit Baptisme and the Eucharist, or the Sacrament of the Altar which they cal the Supper. For though some of them alowe vs also Order, and some, Penance, yet in these Sacramentes as is before declared, they do not agree. But yet if we consider the estimation which they make of these two Sacramentes which al of them alowe vs, we shal see that herein we are not much beholden vnto them.

in Synop. Cal. c. 27. & in c. 3. Gal. Luthers opinion of Baptisme. l. 4 Inst. c. 17 2. And as concerning Baptisme, Luther is of opinion that no forme of words is necessary, yea he thinketh it sufficient, if you baptize the children in the name of the Lord. And being demanded once whether it was lawful to baptise in milke or beare, he answered that any liqeour that is apte to bath or wash, is sufficient. And so you see how he taketh away the matter and forme of Baptisme, or at least bringeth them both in doubt: And as touching the vsual forme of words Caluin iumpeth with him in the same opinion, and addeth that such formes of words are mere magical charmes and enchantementes.

mentes. Brentius sayth that if the minister after that the Crede is read, say only, In this fayth I wash thee, depart in peace, it wil serue wel ynough. And Bucere denyeth that words are necessarie in the Eucharist, and would say no doubt the same in Baptisme. The same Luther as is before related, is of opinion that actual fayth euen in children is necessarie, and that Sacramentes haue no other effect then to stirre vp this fayth. VVherfore seing that Baptisme can not stirre vp childrens faith, because they haue no knowledge of the signification of such mysteries, it must nedes folow that to Baptise children is but *lauerem lauare to wash a tile*, and to loose labour. *in c. 26. Mat.*

3. Caluin also is neither a frayd nor ashamed to say, that S. Iohn Baptists Baptisme was as good as Christs Baptisme. And yet S. Paul rebaptized them vvith Christs Baptism whom S. Ihon before had baptized, vvhich argued his Baptisme of insufficiencie, and prouoth Christs Baptisme to be of more perfection, which suplyed that vvhich was wanting in S. Iohns Baptisme. The same Caluin sayth that in necessitie women may not baptise, and that if the child dye without Baptisme, he may be saued if either he be predestinated or be the child of faithful parentes, yea he sayth that few do marcke how much harme that doctrin hath done, which teacheth that Baptisme is necessary to saluation. And if you vrge him with those wordes of our Sauiour: *Vnles a man be borne againe of Water and the Holy Ghost, &c.* He wil rather glosse the text most grosely, then yeld to you that Baptisme is necessary to saluation. The meaning is not (sayth he) that material water is necessary, but this is the sense: *Vnles a man be borne againe of the Holy Ghost, vvhich like water washeth, he can not enter into heauen.* And so by this exposition water is not necessary, only the regeneration and washing of the spirit is necessary, and this Baptisme according to Caluins opinion, children may haue without water, euen in their mothers wombe, if they be predestinate, or children of faithful parentes. This is Caluins doctrin, I say Caluins, for it is his singular opinion contrarie to opinion of the Church and al the ancient Fathers and Councels, yea contrarie to Scripture it selfe. For Scripture telleth vs plainly that vve are al *borne children* of wrath, and that *vve al sinned in Adam*, and consequently are conceued and borne in original sinne: wherfore Iob who was predestinate curseth the day of his natiuitie and night of his conception, and Dauid not only predestinate but borne also of faithful parentes confesseth *that he is conceiued in sinnes*, that is in original sinne, for the hebreyv vvord signifieth *sinne* in the singular number, *l. 4. Inst. c. 17. 32.* *Act. 19.* *Caluin maketh Baptisme vnnecessarie.* *Io. 3.* *l. 4. Inst. c. 16 17. 18* *A violent exposition of Caluin.* *Al borne in original sinne.* *Ephes. 2.* *Rom 3.* *Iob 5.* *Psal. 50.*

which not withstanding the Translatour translated *sinnes*, because original sinne is the roote of al sinnes.

Gen. 17. The benediction of Abrahams posteritie saueth none frō original sinne.

4. And wheras Caluin alleageth the blessing of God to Abraham and al his seed and posteritie, that serueth only to bewray his ignorance. For first after that God had made that promise, yet he commanded Circumcision, and threatned that those that had it not, should perish. And so although Caluin were of Abrahams seed and his parentes also, yet doth it not folow that he shal be partaker of that benediction without Baptisme. Secondly that promise and benediction is now to be vnderstood carnally or spiritually: if carnally, then are none but Iewes capable of the benediction, because they only are the carnal children of Abraham, and so Caluin hath no part in it at al. If spiritually then they only are partakers of the benediction, who as S. Paul sayth, do imitate the faith and workes of Abraham. VVherefore seing that children euen of faithful parentes, do in no wise imitate either Abrahams faith or workes, they can not be partakers of his benediction vntil they be baptised, and so by receuing the Sacrament of fayth, do in some sorte imitate Abrahams faith. And if Caluin say that at lest by predestination children may be saued without baptisme, he shal but discouer herein how blockish a Diuine he is. For none are predestinate but by the Passion and merites of Christ, which first are applyed by Baptisme, and not without Baptisme at least in desire, and therfore Christ threateneth damnation to al that are not baptised. Wherfore although al children that are predestinate shalbe saued, yet not without Baptisme, and they which dye without Baptisme as by Christs owne sentence they are excluded from heauen, so are they not predestinate.

Rom. 9. Gal. 5.

Aug. ep. 23. ad Bonif. Neither doth predestinatiō.

Io. 3.

Io. 3.

5. But let vs see more of Caluins doctrin, not to folovv it, but to beware of it, not to imbrace it, but to detest it. The same man affirmeth that the reprobate, or the children of infidels not predestinate, are not to be baptized lest Baptisme be contaminated and be made a false seale, because (sayth he) Baptisme is a seale of former iustice, and therfore if defiled infidels be baptised, the vvater is contaminated, and the seale is falsified. He addeth that the children of the faithful or the predestinate, nede not Baptisme as a necessarie meanes vnto saluation, & therfore if they dye without it they may be saued. Yet (sayth he) Baptisme is not to be contēned, because it is commanded as a ceremonie to incorporate vs members of the Church. Now put al this together, to wit, that Christs Baptisme is no better then S. Ihons, that it is not

l. 4 Inst. c. 19. Caluī denyeth baptisme to the reprobate. Ibid. He saith that it is not necessarie for the predestinate and children of the faithful.

necel-

neceſſarie for the predeſtinate, or children of faithful parentes, becauſe they may be ſaued without it, and that it can not be miniſtred vnto the children of infidels, leſt it be contaminated; and it folovveth euidently that Baptiſme is not neceſſarie, yea that it is ſuperfluous, becauſe to the children of the faithful and the predeſtinate it is not neceſſarie, and to the children of the faithles (notwithſtanding that Chriſt bad his Apoſtles to baptiſe al nations which then were infidels) it is not to be giuen, then is there no neceſſarie vſe of Baptiſme, becauſe it ſerueth to no other purpoſe, but to ſeale former iuſtice, which ſealing is not neceſſarie, becauſe ſaluation is ſure ynough without it, or to bring vs into the Church by an external ceremonie, which is altogether nedeles, becauſe if it be omitted, children if they be of faithful parentes, or predeſtinate are ſanctified in their mothers vvemb, and ſo before God are members of the Church, and capable of ſaluation, before and without Baptiſme. And thus Baptiſme is gone.

Mat. vlt.

Caluin in effect taketh Baptiſme avvay l. cont. Luth.

6. Now as concerning the bleſſed Sacrament of the Altar, Luther ſemeth very liberal in this point, affirming that Chriſts body is really and ſubſtantially in this Sacrament not by conſecration but by *Vbiquitie*. For he is of opinion that as Chriſts body is vnited to the Diuinitie, ſo it is in euery place where the Diuinitie is, and conſequently in the bread and vvine. But whileſt Luther thinketh to fil our mouthes in giuing vs bread with Chriſts fleſh, he taketh away al true eating of Chriſts body, and drinking of his bloud. For eating is a conveighance of meate from the mouth into the ſtomake, and therfore if Chriſts body be euery vvhere vvith his Diuinitie, it can not be eaten, becauſe it was before in the ſtomake and euery where, and ſo can not be conveyghed by eating into the ſtomake, becauſe conveighance importeth a motion of a thing to ſome place vvhere before it vvas not.

Iuthers opinion of the B. Sacrament.

Luther taketh avvay al true eating of Chriſts body.

7. Caluin giueth vs a bare figure and an emptie ſigne, auouching that Chriſt hath giuen vs a figure of his body, which in ſubſtãce is but common bread, yet becauſe Chriſt hath made it a ſigne and figure of his body, it is called Chriſts body, as Cæſars image is called Cæſar. Which opinion of Caluin maketh Chriſt a niggard, and his Sacrament of litle or no importance. For Chriſt although he made a great ſhew of a magnifical ſupper, yet according to Caluin, his ſupper was not only inferior to Aſſuerus his banquet, but alſo to the meaneſt that euer was. This ſupper Chriſt would haue to be præfigured by the heauenly Manna, wherewith he fed the Iewes in the deſert: by the Paſchal

Caluĩ maketh the Eucharift a bare figure.

Figures of the Eucharift.

Exod. 16. Ioh. 4. Sap. 6. Pſal. 77.

Exod. 12. *Gen. 14.* *Mal. 1.* *Prophecies of it.* *Gen. 49.* *6. Mac.* *Inuitations to it.* *Prou. 9.* *The tyme.* *The Eucharist by Caluin is but a smel of good cheare.* *Io. 6.* *Ibidem.* *Not so good as Manna or the Paschal lambe.* *Sap. 6.*

schal lambe, which the Iewes were commanded to eate in remembrance of their deliuerãce out of Ægypt: by Melchisedeches Sacrifice and diuerse others: he would also haue it fortold by Malachie the Prophet, saying that a cleane oblation shal be offered vnto him euery vvhere: by the Patriarch *Iacob*, vvho fortold that the Messias should *vvash his stole*, that is his humaine nature with which the Diuinitie was clothed *in the bloud of grapes*, that is in his owne bloud: vvhich he called the bloud of grapes, because it was to be vealed vnder the formes of wine, vvhich is called in Scripture the bloud of the grape. He would inuite also al the world to this banquet, exhorting them to *eate the bread and to drinke the vvine, vvhich he hath mingled for them*, he made this banquet also a litle before his death, for a farewel to his louing and beloued spouse the Church, and yet after al this ostentation, after this solemne inuitation, notwithstanding also that the tyme of farewel, the dignitie of Christs person, and the preeminence of the new Law aboue the olde, required a most sumptuous banquet, vvhen the supper was prepared, it proued but bread and wine, and after al this boste, the guestes vvho were bidden, had no roste at al, but only an odour and smel of good chere, that is a bare signe and figure of Christs body and bloud. And wheras Christ promised a twelue moneth before that he would giue them an other maner of meate, and more excellent then *Manna* was: for (sayth he) notwithstanding that your forfathers were fed with manna yet they dyed, but vvho soeuer eateth of the bread which I shal giue, shal liue for euer: yet if we beleeue Caluin, he performed nothing lesse. For if Christs bread be but common bread in substance, and only a signe of Christs flesh, vvhich is *the true foode*, then vvas not only Manna, but the Paschal lambe also farre more pretious then the bread of Christ. For the Paschal lambe was flesh, Christs banquet is but bread and wine in substance, and as this is a figure of Christ, so was that and a more apte figure. Manna also was made by Angels handes, and in the aire, Christs bread or rather Caluins cake, was moulded and baked by mens handes, and in no better place, then the backhouse; Manna had al tastes and delightes, Christs bread if it be no better then Caluin maketh it, hath but one taste and that not very delicate. And as Caluin sayth, that Christs breade is a signe and figure of Christ, so was Manna also, as Christs bread stirreth vp faith because it is a signe, so was manna as fitte for that purpose, because it was a signe, and as good a signe, because it signified the same thing, vvhich giueth perfection vnto both signes. Wherfore vnles this Sacrament contayne Christs

body

body and bloud in an other maner then the signe containeth the thing vvhich it signifieth, Christs banquet is no better, yea it is not so good as Manna vvas, and so the veritie shal be inferior to the figure.

8 But Caluin sayth, that this Sacrament is not a bare figure, but such as bringeth with it the body and bloud of Christ: and if he did meane as he speaketh, I would not dispute with him, but would shake hands with him as with a Catholique. These are his wordes: *I say that in the mystery of the Supper by the signes of bread and vvine, is Christ truly deliuered, yea and his body and his bloud.* And a litle before those wordes he giueth the reason; *because* (sayth he) *Christs vvordes: This is my body, are so plaine, that vnles a man vvil cal God a deceiuer, he can neuer be so bold as to say that he setteth before vs an emptie signe.* And yet againe he repeateth this his assertion: *In his holy Supper Christ commandeth me vnder the signes of bread, and vvine, to eate his body and drinke his bloud, and I nothing doubt but that both he doth truly deliuer them, and I do receiue them.* And lest you should thinke that he talketh only of eating and receiuing Christ spiritually by faith, he hath preuented you by saying, that he meaneth really, and alleageth S. Chrysostom, vvho sayth that Christ mingleth his substance with ours, in this Sacrament, not only by faith, but in very dede. What thinke you now of this man? is he not a Catholique? doth he not really auouch the real presence? But if you vnmaske this vvily felow, you shal see a wolfe vnder a sheepes skinne. For the same Caluin in the same chapter in plaine wordes telleth you, that Christ is not really in this Sacrament, nor any vvhere else out of heauen, but yet (sayth he) the bread and vvine is called the body and bloud of Christ by a figure, vvhich calleth the signe by the name of the thing it selfe, as the Arke or rocke may be called Christ, because it was a figure of Christ. What meaneth he then vvhen he sayth that with the signe we receiue the body and bloud of Christ verelie? his meaning is, that although Christs substance be as far from this Sacrament, as heauen is from earth, yet because this signe stirreth vp faith, and faith apprehendeth Christ by this signe and with it we receiue the body & bloud of Christ. But here Caluin seemeth to go from him selfe, for as you haue heard he sayd before, that we eate not Christ only by faith, but also in very dede; yet to saue him selfe from contradiction, he hath deuised a subtile dinstinction. I grant (sayth he) that there be that in one word define, that to eate the body of Christ, and to drinke his bloud, is nothing else but to beleue in Christ, but I say that the flesh of Christ is eaten by beleuing, because by faith it is made ours. So that Caluin is of opi-

l. 4. Inst. c. 17. 15.

Eodem cap. 6.

Hom. 61. 61. ad pop.

Caluin seemeth a Catholique but is not.

Sect. 20. 21. 22 Caluins meaning.

Sect. 16.

Supra.

Sect. 5.

of opinion that this Sacrament is but a ſigne and conteineth not really the body and bloud of Chriſt, but yet becauſe this ſigne ſtirreth vp faith vvhich apprehendeth Chriſts body, we receiue verily the body and bloud of Chriſt vvith this ſigne, and by it, becauſe faith apprehending Chriſt, vniteth him vnto vs & maketh him verily our owne. This is Caluins opinion.

9. Out of vvhich let vs take as granted that Chriſts body and bloud are not really conteined in the Sacrament, & conſequently that this Sacrament is no better, yea nor ſo good as *Manna* vvas, vvhich was as good a ſigne of Chriſt, as this Sacrament is, if this containe not Chriſt really, and vvas as apte to ſtirre vp faith. Secondly it is cleare that if Chriſt be not really in this Sacrament, then faith can not really vnite him vnto vs, and conſequently that in and by this Sacrament, we can in nowiſe really be partakers of Chriſts body and bloud. For proofe wherof I demand of Caluin, how faith can really conioine vs with Chriſt? either this fayth really plucketh Chriſt out of heauen, vvhich Caluin neither can ſay, becauſe faith is but an apprehenſion, neither wil ſay, becauſe he ſayth that Chriſts body ſince his aſcenſion was neuer out of heauen: or elſe it really lifteth vs vp to heauen, vvhich is againſt experience, and ſo can not really vnite Chriſt vnto vs, becauſe it neither bringeth him really vnto vs, nor vs vnto him. And ſo in beleuing in Chriſt by faith vvhich is but an apprehenſion of the vnderſtanding, we do no more really eate the body of Chriſt, then doth the hungrye man his dinner, vvhen he apprehendeth, and deſireth it, but can not haue it. And ſo Caluins boſte is greater then his roſte, and his promiſe is more ample then his performance, and Chriſts ſupper is but a bare ſigne, and no meate at al, but only a ſauour and ſigne of good cheare, and our eating is no real eating, but only a naked apprehenſion. And ſeing that preaching, and pictures, can better ſtir vp faith then bread and wine can do, this Sacrament of Chriſt is altogether nedles, becauſe as good neuer a whit as neuer the better. And ſo my intended concluſion foloweth to witte, that amongſt our reformers there is no Religion becauſe, fiue or ſix, of ſeuen Sacramentes they haue quite taken away, and the other in vvhich al of them agree, to wit Baptiſme and the Euchariſt, they haue ſo diſgraced and defaced, that they are to litle purpoſe, and ſo they haue no Religion, becauſe no Sacramentes no Religion.

By faith only vve can really receiue Chriſt.

Caluins boſt greater then coſte.

The cõcluſion.

The Sixt Chapter shevveth, that according to their doctrin they can haue no prayer, and consequently no Religion.

ONE of the greatest benefits, which God hath bestovved on man is prayer, by which man hath accesse vnto God, and the creature is admitted to the speach of his Creator, and flesh and bloud conuerseth familiarly with the Diuinitie. For as S. Austin saith, when vve read Scriptures which are the word of God, then God speaketh to vs, but when we occupie our selues in prayer, then do we speake familiarly to God. Which is so great a thing, that Angels dare not do it, without couering their faces with their immortal vvinges, blushing to appeare before such Maiestie, and trembling to speake to a Prince so mightie. Prayer is honourable to God, honourable also and profitable to our selues. It is honourable to God because it is an act of Religion, by which we prostrate euen our soules and spirits vnto God, acknowledging him the supreme essence, fountaine, and autour of al goodnes, and our selues his needy and naked creatures, vvho haue nothing of our selues, yea nothing but from him, not so much as our selues, because he gaue vs our selues, and being for nothing, and of nothing. It is honourable to our selues, first because it æqualizeth vs with Angels, making vs Quiresters of their chappel, where by prayer we ioine voices with them, in prayfing God as they do, and praying vnto him. Secondly because it procureth familiar conuersation with God, vvhich is so honourable a thing, and so rayseth vs in state and dignitie, as almost nothing more. For as S. Chrysostom sayth if it be such an honour to conuerse familiarly with Cæsar, that such men though otherwise neuer so base and poore, can not whilest they are in this credit with him, be any more either base or poore: how can they who in prayer conuerse dayly and familiarly vvith the Diuine Maiestie, be of base or low condition? It is profitable also vnto vs, because by it we obtaine at Gods handes what is expedient for vs. For God is the source and fountaine of al goodnes, and perfection, sufficient of him selfe, and within him selfe, needing

in Psal. 75. Vvhat a benefit prayer is.

It is honourable to God.

It is honourable to our selues

Orat. 1. de orando Deo.

It is also profitable.

Psal. 15.

God is to him selfe sufficiēt.

needing not in any thing the helpe of any. To whom vvhen we haue giuen al the prayses, and offered al the Hecatombes and Sacrifices in the world, we haue not abettered his state or his person, and when we haue reuiled him and blasphemed him to the vttermost of our malice, we haue not made him a iotte the worse: but man in that he is a creature is depēdent of his Creator, no lesse yea more, then the riuers of the fountaine, the branches of the tree, or the sunne beames of the Sunne: who of him selfe hath nothing, yea is nothing, but is to liue by begging and praying.

Man liueth by begging.

2. And wel he may so obteine those thinges vvhich he wanteth. For if any Prince would promise his subiect, that vvhat soeuer he asketh he should obtein, might not that subiect thinke that Prince very bountiful, and him selfe a most happie subiect? Thus God dealeth with vs; he biddeth vs *aske and vve shal haue*: and seing that God is so faithful that he can as soone deny him selfe as go from his word, because his word is him selfe, he can not, but performe, vvhat soeuer he promiseth: and seing that prayer is the thing by vvhich man obtaineth at Gods hand what soeuer he iustly desireth, what an inestimable gemme and precious pearle is prayer, vvhich procureth our hartes desires in al thinges, because it is the price of al? And if we some tymes pray, and obtaine not, either it is becausе our prayer is not such as it ought to be, or that the thing vvhich we pray for, is not conuenient for vs. For if he that prayeth, beleueth that God can helpe him, and hopeth also that he wil helpe him, if he him selfe vvho prayth, or he for whom he prayeth, be not odious to God by reason of sinne; if he pray with humlitie, and without a doubting mynd, if he adione to his prayer, attention, to his attention, deuotion, and to both perseuerance, and if the thing for vvhich he prayth be necessatie or expedient (for otherwise God is a greater benefactour in dnying then granting our petition) then certainly, such is the vertue of prayer, that vvhat we aske we haue, and vvhat we pray for, we obtaine. Prayer certes is better then the Philosophers stone, although it were of that vertue vvhich it is fayned to be of: for as fooles haue fained it was able to turne al into gold, but prayer turneth al to our good be it gold or siluer, riches or pouertie, health or sicknes, grace or glorie. Yea it is better then Fortunatus hatt is fained to haue bene, because that procured al withes good or bad indifferently, but prayer then only obteineth vvhat vve vvish for, vvhen our wishes are expedient or conuenient for vs.

Mat. 7.

Prayer obtayneth.

Prayer better then the Philosophes stone.

Prayer satisfiet.

3. Besides this vnspeakable vertue vvhich prayer hath, to obteine vvhat

vvhat we aske for, it satisfieth for sinne also, especially vvhen it is joined with almes dedes and fasting, vvhich are the vvinges of prayer, by vvhich it soreth sepedily euen to the throne of God. It meriteth glorie as other good vvorkes do, and that more especially also, in that it is a prayer. It giueth vs great confidence also if it be frequent and vsual, because as before I haue sayd, prayer causeth familiaritie, and familiaritie imboldeneth, and boldnesse breedeth confidence. It is a great motiue also vnto humilitie, and peraduenture you shal not fynd a greater, because it putteth vs alwayes in mynd that we are but beggars. And lastly (if I may say so of prayers commodities vvhich are without end) it maketh vs to fal out of loue with this deceiteful vvorld because it maketh vs to conuerse in heauen, & admitteth vs to familiaritie with God & his Angels. In the Church triumphant prayer is vsed, because the Saintes & Angels pray to God for vs, In the Church militant prayer also is practised, as shal be proued, only in hel and hellish Synagogues prayer is abandoned.

Tob. 12.

It meriteth.

It maketh vs confident.

Humble.

Out of loue vvith the vvorld.

Prayer is in heauen.

In hel it is not

4. Wherfore in the law of nature, as they vsed Sacrifice, so did they practise prayer, and although Seth and Enos be called the first of them who by prayer, most especially and frequently called vpon God, yet no doubt Adam and Eue amongst other actes of penance, omitted not prayer as one of the best dispositions vnto reconciliation with almightie God. Abel their sonne also, as he was religious in his Sacrifices, so was he not slothful in prayer. Noê also taught his posteritie prayer, Abraham was much giuen to prayer. Isaac his sonne in his diligence in prayer and meditation also declared him selfe worthily to haue bene the sonne of such a father. Dauid prayed seuen tymes a day, and rose at midnight often tymes, shortning his sleepe to lengthen his prayer: and Daniel three tymes a day called vpon his God. By prayer, Moyses made the Sea to diuide it selfe, & procured victorie to the Israelits so long as in prayer he held vp his handes, yea by prayer he obtained pardon often times for the people & bond as it were the hands of the omnipotent. By prayer Anne the wife of Helcan obteined Samuel. Ezechias by prayer prolonged his life fiftene yeares. Tobias by the same exercise was restored to his sight. Elias after a great drought by prayer obtained raine.

It vvas in the lavv of nature

Gen. 24.

Psal. 118.

Dan. 4.

Exod. 16.

1. Reg. 2.

4. Reg. 26.

Tob. 12.

3. Reg 16.

Mat. 14.

Luc. 4.

Mat. 26.

5. In the new law Christ our High Priest prayed oftentymes al the night long, and a litle before his departure out of this vvorld, he prayed three tymes in the garden: yea he him selfe taught vs the prayer vvhich in Inglish we cal our Lords prayer. And no sooner was Christ

Prayer very frequent in the lavv of grace.

departed, but his Apoſtles and diſciples aſſembled them ſelues toge-
Act. 2. ther, and in prayer attended the Holy Ghoſts deſcenſion. S. Peter and
Act. 3. S. Ihon aſcended into the Temple to pray. S. Peter furrowed his face
Clem. Rom. with the ſtreames of teares, which trickled yea ſtreamed from his eyes
in prayer. S. Bartholomew is ſayd to haue prayed on his knees an hun-
dred tymes in the day and as ofthen in the night. S. Iames knees by
Bar. to. 2. an. prayer became as hard as camels knees. Whoſe examples the firſt Chri-
100. ſtians after the Apoſtles folowing, met together dayly at prayer, euen
l 10. ep. 97 1. before they had Churches, in ſo much that Traian the Emperour for-
Tert. Apol. c. bid ſuch flocking together. And Plinie prefect of this Emperour, in-
2. formed him of the aſſemblies of Chriſtianes to prayer before day. To
be briefe, the Eccleſiaſtical hiſtories are ful of the Churches, and mo-
naſteries vvhich haue bene builded for prayer, & ſpeake almoſt of no-
Hieron. ep. ad thing elſe but of Chriſtiás prayers, maſſes, Liturgies canonical howers,
Euſtoch. as nocturnes, lauds, the prime hower of prayer, third, ſixt, ninth
Aeban. l. de hower, Euenſong, and Complete: yea ſo is prayer diuided in diuers
V. rg Baſi 37. Churches and monaſteries, that in euery vigil of the night in one
Clem l. 8. place or other, prayers and prayſes are ſongue to God: yea ſeing that
Conſt. c. 4. our Church is diſperſed through out the vvorld, and that the hower
Tho. VValds. vvhich is to one countrie, one, to an other is two, to an other, is three
to 3. de Sacra- a clocke, and ſo forth, there is no hower in the day or night in vvhich
mental. c. 20. prayer is not exerciſed publickely in the Church. So that wel is the
Iſa 56. Catholique Church called the *houſe of God, becauſe it is the houſe of prayer.*
Luc. 19. 6. Now let vs ſee how like vnto this houſe of God, which is the
houſe of prayer, our Reformers Sinagogue is. In moſt places they
haue no prayer at al on working dayes, and on holy dayes (vvhich
now they haue brought to a leſſe number, becauſe they celebrate few
Saintes dayes) they ſpẽd almoſt al the tyme that they are in the Church
Litle vſe of in yelling out a Geneua Pſalme, to vvhich they adde a Sermon: and ge-
prayer amõgſt nerally in England now adayes, you ſhal find few that vſe any priuate
the reformers. prayer in their chambers, but as dogges go to their kennel, ſo they go
to bed, and ſo they riſe in the morning, ſhaking or ſtretching them
ſelues out, neuer bowing knee, no nor opening mouth nor hart in
A Prieſt ap- prayer. In ſo much that vvhen one of our Catholiques in his Inne in
prehended vp- London vvas found by the chamberlaine, kneeling by his bed ſide, to
pon ſuſpicion ſay his deuotions, proclamation vvas by and by made, that he was a
becauſe he Prieſt and a traitour (for then in England they were al one) as if their
prayed. owne conſciences had accuſed them, that prayer is no ſigne of a man
of their religion.

7. And

7. And truly this contempt of prayer amongst them is not to be blamed by their preachers, because it is most conformable to their doctrin. For first they say that prayer meriteth no reward at Gods hands. Secondly they auouch thatit can not make the least satisfaction, for the least sinne in the world. Why then should we weare our hose out in the knees with praying, if prayer neither satisfieth, nor meriteth, any thing at Gods hands? Truly if we weare our hose out, we lose more then we gette, if this doctrin be true. Thirdly Caluin auoucheth that the iustifying faith is a firme and ful assurance that we are elect and iust by Christs iustice; and seing that faith is a necessarie disposition to prayer (for as S. Paul sayth how shal they pray and cal vpon him, in whom they beleue not? it folovveth that before we settle our selues to prayer, vve must firmely beleue that we are iust and that our sinnes are forgiuen VVhence I gather these conclusions. First that in vaine the faithful man praeyth for iustification or remission of sinnes, because before he prayeth, his sinnes are forgiuen, and he is iustified, or else his ful assured faith is a lying and deceiptful faith. The second is that no faithful man can pray for iustification or remission of sinnes, vnles he vvil be an infidel and forsake his faith by praying. For he is bound by Caluin to beleue assuredly that his sinnes are forgiuen, because this is his iustifying faith, and if he stagger or doubt he is an infidel, because he hath not the right faith; vvhence it foloweth that in praying for remission of sinnes, he loseth faith, because in that he prayeth, he shevveth that he hath not that assurance: for who wil pray for that vvhich he is assured of already? Or if he pray it is an argument that either he thinketh that he hath not the thing for vvhich he prayeth, or that he doubteth therof, or that he feareth, of which euery one is sufficient to make a man an infidel in Caluins opinion, because they despoile him of that assured faith. The third conclusion is that he can not pray at al for remission of sinnes, would he neuer so faine euen with losse of his faith. For as if I be in good health, and assure my selfe of the same, I can not pray for health, though I may pray for continuance of it, so if before I pray, I be assured that my sinnes be forgiuen, though I may vvith lippes, yet vvith hart I can not pray, that God would forgiue me: and if I could in vaine should I pray for that which I haue already. The fourth is that no faithful man can pray for eternal blisse in heauen: for if before I pray I must haue faith (as S. Paul saith I must) and if faith be a ful assurance that I am not only iust, but also elected, and chosen to be one of the

Gal. l. 3. Inst. c. 70.
Melanct. tit. de peccat.
Contemp of prayer conformable to the nevv Religiō.
See the seuenth booke.
l. 3. inst. c. 2. 6. 7. 9. 10. 16. 19
Rom. 10.
Caluī maketh prayer for remissiō of sinne a vaine thing.
yea pernicious to faith.
yea impossible
An example.
Rom. 10.
No man by Caluin can pray for eternal blisse.

Citizens of heauen, I can not vvith hart pray that I may be receiued into heauen. VVel I may pray that speedilie God wil take me to him, and his glorie, because I am not sure when shal be the time, at vvhich he vvil cal me, but to pray absolutely to be admitted vnto God his glorie and Kingdom, I can not possibly, because by Caluins faith, I am already assured of this kingdom and glorie. But Caluin vvil obiect against vs that S. Iames biddeth vs pray in faith and confidence, nothing doubting or staggering. I grant that vve must beleue that God can helpe, and hope also that he wil helpe, and so vve must not pray doubting, but yet vve may and must pray betvvixt feare & hope. For if I hope not, but despaire of obtaining, I haue no cause to pray, and if I doubt of Gods mercie, I do him iniurie, yet if I be sure, I can not pray, and therfore I must feare the worst and yet pray for the best. Moreouer Caluin telleth vs that the iustifying faith assureth vs not only of present, but also of future iustice, that is, acertaineth vs not only that we are now at this present iust, but also that we shal persecuer vnto the end: whence it foloweth that we can not pray to God for perseuerance in grace, or that he wil so assist vs, that no tentation of the diuel, insurrection of the flesh, or allurement of the world, giue vs the foyle or fal: because by faith we are assured of our standing. He auoucheth also that sinne hath so weakened mans nature, that he can not vvith al the grace that Christ hath giuen, resist any tentation. Whence enseweth also that he can not pray, not to be ledde into tentation, that is not to be permitted to yeld to tentation, because he is assured by Caluins doctrin, that he can not but yeld if he once be tempted. And although these tvvo last points seeme contradictorie, because the one saith, that a faithful man can not fal from iustice, the other saith, that he can not but yeld to sinne and tentation, which is the fal of the soule: yet Caluin hath a way to auoide this cõtradiction, because (saith he) though a faithful man yeld to tentation, yet God imputeth it not as sinne, because he is faithful, and so saith he, a faithful man is assured that he can not fal: and then say I, that I am assured that he can not pray that he may stand, and not fal by tentation. He is also of opinion that the best workes of a iust man are so vncleane that they are mortal sinnes: which if it be true, then can vve not pray that Gods name be halowed and sanctified in vs, that is in our workes, because neither in vs, not in our actions, is any one iotte of true sanctitie. He denyeth also frievvil and al voluntarie cooperation with Gods vvil and grace. And so vve can not pray that Gods vvil be doone

Iac. 3.
Caluins obiection.
The answver.
See the seuẽth booke.
l. 4. Inst. c. 2. 8. 28.
Nor for perseuerance.
See the same booke.
Nor for ayd against tentation.
l. 2. Inst. c. 5. l. 3 c. 14.
nor that Gods name be hal loued vs.
Al the opinions of Cal-

doone in vs: for a prayer argueth some dependence of Gods wil on ours, which so would haue vs to do wel, as it wil leaue it in our powre to resist the wil and grace of God. And if Caluin obiect those vvords of Scripture: *Who resisteth his vvil?* I answer that no man can resist Gods wil, when he wil absolutely haue it fulfilled and independently of vs, but yet we may resist Gods wil, when he willeth dependently of our willes, else vvould he not haue sayd: *hovv often vvould I haue gathered thee as a henne gathereth her chickins together and thou vvouldest not.* Now put al this together and you shal see that the *Pater noster*, or our Lords prayer, must be cut out of the Catichisme, and blotted out of the Reformers Gospel. For although Christ taught his Apostles that prayer, yet according to Caluins doctrin no faithful man, that is, no Caluinist, can in conscience recite that prayer. And so either Christ is deceiued or Caluin teacheth false doctrin: but Caluin wil svveare that he teacheth the truth and that he is sure that a faithful man is sure of his iustice, remission of sinnes, and election: & therfore you know what foloweth. But lest you thinke that I do iniurie to Caluin in affirming that he taketh away the Lords prayer, as vnlawful & quite repugnant to Christian faith, I wil proue it manifestly and by no other argument, then by calling to mynd that vvhich is already sayed.

uin see in the seuenth booke. l.1. Inst.c.8.

Rom. 9.

Mat. 27.

Caluin taketh avvay our lords prayer.

8. In the first petition of our Lordes prayer we desire that his name be halowed in vs, vvhich is a prayer cleane apposit to Caluins opinion, vvhich teacheth that there is no sanctitie in vs or our workes, and so holding his opinion, we must omit the first petition. In the second, vve pray that his Kingdom may come, and that we may be receiued into it, vvhich petition we can not make from our hart, if before we pray, we are assured by faith (as Caluin saith) that we are elect and predestinate to that kingdom, as before is proued. The third is that Gods wil be done in heauen as in earth, vvhich petition also according to Caluin is friuolous, for if we cooperate not with God by our friewil, in vayne do we pray that his wil be doone in earth, because that argueth some dependence of Gods wil on ours, as is before demonstrated. The fourth is that God wil giue vs our daylye bread, that is al those benefites either of Nature or Grace, vvhich are belonging either to soule or bodye: vvhich petition also can not stand with Caluins faith: because if faith assureth me of present & future iustice, yea and of glorie also, and as Caluin saith it doth, then I can not pray either for iustification, or remission of sinnes, or perseuerance in grace, or final glorie, because no man can pray for that vvhich he is assured of, as

Hovv he taketh avvay the first petition. l.2. Inst.c.5.§. 3.c.14.

Hovv the second. l.3. Inst.c.2.

Hovv the 3. l.1. Inst.c.8.

Hovv the third.

Hovv the fourth.

l.3. Inst.c.2.

of, as is before declared. And ſo we can only pray for health, riches, fayre wether, or ſuch like corporal benefites: yea if it be true that al theſe thinges come by fatal neceſſitie (as Caluin muſt ſay that they do) becauſe he affirmeth that Gods foreſight and decree impoſeth a neceſſitie vpon al thinges, and conſequently on theſe thinges alſo, becauſe he foreſeeth and decreeth theſe thinges no leſſe then he doth mens actions: then in vayne alſo do we pray for health, or vvelth, or faire weather, becauſe theſe thinges of neceſſitie ſhal be or not be whether we wil or no, and as vaine it is to pray for health or welth, as for the ſunne riſing vvhich of neceſſitie riſeth vvhether vve pray or no. In the fifth petition vve demande that God, wil forgiue vs our treſpaſſes and offences, vvhich as is before proued, we can not pray for without loſſe of our fayth, vvhich if it be right, aſſureth vs without al doubt that they are already forgiuen. The ſixt and ſeuenth are that God wil not permit vs to fal into temptation, and by tentation, but deliuer vs from al euil, eſpecially of ſinne: vvhich petitions alſo are vaine, yea impoſſible if Caluins faith be true. For if by faith I be aſſured of future iuſtice, I can not pray with hart that God wil aſſiſt me that I fal not from iuſtice, becauſe I am (as Caluin ſayth) ful wel aſſured that I ſhal not fal, and ſo I can no more pray, that I may not fal by tentation, then that the heauens may not fal vpon me, being as ſure of the one, as the other, and if ſinne and other euils befal vs of neceſſitie (as Caluin ſaith they do) in vaine do we pray to be deliuered from al euil. And ſo our Lordes prayer can not ſtand if Caluins doctrin do go for currant: and ſeing that this prayer was made by Chriſt, if we wil folow Caluin we muſt forſake Chriſt: and for as much, as this prayer conteineth in a briefe ſumme, and methode, al thinges vvhich we are to pray for, if by Caluins doctrin we can not ſay this prayer, vvhich is a *Compendium* of al prayers and petitions, we can not pray at al, and ſo no prayer can be vſed in Caluins Church according to Caluins doctrin.

l. 1. Inſt. c. 15. 8.

Hovv the fifth

Hovv the ſixt and ſeuenth.

Hovv he taketh avvay al prayer.

9. VVherfore I meruaile not that ſo litle prayer is practiſed amongſt them, I vvonder not that they build no nevv Churches, but pul dovvne the old vvhich vvere builded for prayer: rather I meruaile that they ſometimes exhort men to prayer, ſeing that their doctrin and prayer can not ſtand together. And I like better of Luther and of his plaine dealing in this matter, for he hauing once pronounced ſentẽce that faith only iuſtifieth, affirmeth conſequently that prayer is not neceſſarie, theſe are his vvordes: *Euery hart hovv much the more perfect*

knovvledge

knovvledge (he meaneth the knovvledge of faith) *it hath of it ſelfe, ſo much, more ready is the vvay for God vnto it, although in the meane tyme a man ſhould drinke nothing but malmeſey and vvalke vpon roſes, and neuer pray one vvorde.* And ſo if Caluin vvould deale as plainly as Luther doth, as he agreeth vvith him in the premiſes, to vvit, that only faith ſufficeth, ſo ſhould he alſo agree vvith him in the concluſion, vvhich is, that prayer is not neceſſary. *Ser. de Dom. 4. Aduent. edit. an. 1525. Luth. plainly ſaith that no prayer is neceſſarie.*

10. But it is time now that I alſo come to my concluſion, to vvit that amongſt our reformers is no Religion, becauſe by their doctrin they can haue no prayer: vvhich concluſion if the premiſes be called to mynd doth folovv eaſily, and euidently. Becauſe prayer in al lawes vvas euer neceſſarie to the vpholding of Religion, as I haue proued by induction, and the reaſon alſo is, becauſe it is one of the moſt principal actes of Religion, by vvhich vve acknovvledge Gods ſouerainitie, and our ovvne baſenes and beggerie, but amongſt the reformers no prayer, not ſo much as the Lords prayer, can be vſed, as is alſo proued, *ergo* amongſt them there is no Religion: becauſe prayer and Religion muſt of neceſſitie go together. And ſo our reformers haue no ſeruice to vſe in their Churches but onlie a ſermon: vvhich alſo I ſee not to vvhat purpoſe it is amongſt them if men haue no frie vvil: for then as vvel may their miniſters preach to a flocke of ſheep, as to a Church ful of faithful people, becauſe theſe haue no more frie vvil (if vve beleue Caluin) then they haue: and ſo are as abſurdely exhorted by a Sermon as they. And if Caluin vvould laugh at a Miniſter that ſhould perſvvade ſhepe and aſſes to abſtinence, labour, and ſuch like, vve may laugh at him and his miniſters vvhen by a laboured Sermon, they go about to perſvvade men to vertue, or to diſſvvade from vice, vvho haue no more frie vvil to folovv ſuch perſvvaſions then ſhepe or aſſes haue. *Hovv Luther and Caluin take avvay ſermons alſo.*

THE

THE FIFTE BOOKE CONTAINETH A SVRVEY OF THEIR DOCTRIN CONCERNING GOD, IN WHICH is declared, hovv impious the Reformers are, and hovv iniurious their doctrin is to the Diuine Maiestie.

The first Chapter shevveth hovv they make God the autour of al sinne and vvickednes.

SIMON Magus the first Arch-heretike of fame, was the first man that opened his mouth to the vtterance of this blasphemie, but he had no sooner broken the yse, but by and by Florinus, Blastus, Cerdon, Marcion, and Manicheus, vvith open mouth, & common voice, applauded to his blasphemie, agreing vvith him that God is the autor of al sinne and euil. Yea because this doctrin semed to offensiue to Christian eares, they deuised a kind of moderation, to make their doctrin mote sailable. VVherfore Simon Magus sayd, that God was the autor of sinne, not that he immediately moueth vs to sinne, but because he hath giuen vs such a nature, which of necessitie sinneth, and so by a certaine consequence, he sayd God was the the autor of sinne. Cerdon and Manicheus also were ashamed to father sinne vpon the good God, and therfore they affirmed, that there were tvvo Gods, the one good, the other bad: and that the euil God vvas the autor of sinne and euil.

Tert. l. præsc. c. 13.

Heretikes vvho sayd God vvas the autor of sinne

2. But

2. But Caluin and his folovvers (as it is easier to adde then to inuent) haue farre exceded and ouerreached them in malice, auouching that God immediately and directely, is the author of al vvickednes, vvhich Simon Magus durst not say, yea the good and the only God vvorketh and effectuateth this malice, vvhich those ancient heretikes were ashamed to say. These are Caluins vvordes, or rather blasphemies: *God not only forseeth mans sinnes, but also hath created him of determinate purpose to that end.* And a litle after: *God not only permitteth sinne but vvilleth it.* Yea sayth he: *It is not likely that man by him selfe by the only permission of God, vvithout any ordinance, brought destruction to himselfe* And therfore, *vvhen Absalon abused his Fathers vvines, it vvas Gods vvil* (sayth he) *so to punish Dauids adulterie, and God commanded him to do it to that end.* Again he sayth that *God blindeth and hardneth the reprobate not only by not illuminating them nor mollifying them by grace, but because he stirreth vp their vvilles: And not only suffereth sinners, but bovveth and turneth their hartes.* So that according to Caluins opinion God not only forseeth that vve vvil sinne, but ordayneth vs to sinne, not only permitteth vs to sinne, but willeth and commandeth, yea boweth our hartes to sinne. And lest you should thinke, that at least God hath no part in those sinnes, to which the Diuel and vvicked men prouoke vs, or that the iniuries, vvhich they do vs, procede not at al from him, he auoucheth that Satan and euil men in these euil offices, are but the instrumentes of God, and that God setteth them on, and is the principal agent and author. *I grant* (sayth he) *that theues and murderers and other euil doers are the instrumentes of Gods prouidence, vvhom the Lord doth vse to execute those iudgementes, vvhich he hath himselfe determined.* Yea he sayth, *that vvhat our enemy mischeuously doth against vs, he doth as suffred and sent by God*: And he is not afrayed to say *that God armeth as vvel diuiles as vvicked men against vs.* And that *Sennacherib vvas an axe and instrument of God directed and drinen by his hand to cutte. Finally* sayth he: *the vncleane spirit is called the spirit of the Lord, because he answereth his commandement and povver, being rather his instrument in doing, then an author of himselfe.* By vvhich speaches who seeth not, that Caluin maketh God a greater Patrone of sinne, then the diuil, because the diuil is but his instrument and minister in al the euil he doth, God is the principal Agent and commander. The like saying hath Melanchon, vvho *auoucheth that Dauids adulterie and Iudas treachery, vvere as much the vvorke of God, as S. Paules vocation.* The like hath Beza and diuers others, vvhose blasphemies I list no more to relate, neither can Christian eares desire to heare them.

Caluin vverse in this then they.

l. 4. Inst. c. 29. 6.

his blaspemies.

l. 2. c. 18. 4.

l. 2. c. 4. 2. 3. 4.

Ibidem.

l. 37. 2. 3.

l. 2. c. 4 sect. 1.

Sect. 4.

Sect. 6.

In c. 8. ep. Rom.

Catholiques opinions in this point.

3. Much more honourably doth the Catholique Church speake of the Diuine Maiestie, which auerreth that God is the authour of the paine of sinne, because in that is no sinne, but iustice; but not of the malice of sinne: likvvise confesseth that God permitteth al sinnes that are, because he wil not force mens libertie; yea suffereth also the diuil and his ministers to prouoke vs to sinne, but neither willeth, nor commandeth them so to doe; Catholiques also teach that God is so the authour of al essence and goodnes, that he concurreth with our wil to the substance of the act of sinne, but hath no part in the malice of the sinne. And vvhere Scripture semeth to say, that God is the autour of euil or commandeth euil men, or sayth that the wicked are his instrumentes: the Catholique Church sayth that this is to be vnderstood by permission only. Yea this Church teacheth vs, that God neuer vseth euil persons as instruments moued by him to sinne, but only permitteth them to sinne, and afterwards vseth this their sinne, either to the iust punishement of them selues or of others, or to the glorie of his seruantes, whose patience by euil persons is tryed, or to a greater repentance of the sinner, who being fallen into such abomininations, thinketh of a greater repentance: as king Dauid, Mary Magdalen, and some others did.

The first reasō vvhy God can not be the autor of sinne.

Mat. 7.

4. And certainly it is as euident that God can not be the authour of sinne, as that he can not but be God. For first of al, God is goodnes it selfe, and therfore as euil frutes can not proceed from a good tree, because they are contrarie to the good nature and disposition of the tree, so from so good a nature as God is, who is *summum bonum* and goodnes it selfe, we must not looke for so euil frutes as sinnes are, in vvhich is no goodnes at al: and therfore to say that he is the autour of sinne, is to make him an euil God, and of a malitious nature, as Cerdon and Manicheus did, and so no God at al. For God and Good must of necessitie go together. *The second.* Secōdly sinne is as opposite to Gods goodnes as falsehood is to his *veritie*, but God can not lye, nor authorize a lie, because he is the *first veritie: ergo* he can not be the autour of sinne, because he is the chiefest goodnes: or if such goodnes can do euil, such veritie and truth may lye, and so the Scriptures loose their credit. For if God can lye, peraduenture in Scriptures he hath lyed: and to say that God can be the autour of sinne, is to say consequently that he may be the autour of lyes, vvhich is to open the gap to Atheistes and mispriſers of Scriptures. For as wel may he moue the writers of Scriptures to write lyes, as he may moue them to sinne and wickednes. *The third.* Thirdly if God be

authour of ſinne, then by his wil, vvhich is the cauſe of al thinges, he worketh ſinne, vvhich if it be ſo, then ſinne is according to Gods wil, and ſo no ſinne: becauſe that vvhich is according to the Princes wil, can neither diſpleaſe his wil, nor impeach his commandement, and conſequently is neither offence nor preuarication. Fourthly euerie error is a ſweruing from the rule which is preſcribed, and therefore the artificer erreth vvhen he worketh not according to his platforme, or *idea*, and the ſinger erreth vvhen he ſingeth not according to his Gamma vt, and the writer ſcribleth, vvhen he foloweth not his example, and the ſubiect tranſgreſſeth, vvhen he liueth not according to the Princes good law, and the moral man offendeth, when he foloweth not reaſon, vvhich is the lore, rule, and ſquare of al his actions. And becauſe al theſe workers are diſtinct from their rule, they may ſweruе from the ſame, and ſo commit a fault in their art: but God (ſayth S. Thomas) is to him ſelfe a rule, and foloweth no other law or rule then his æternal reaſon and law, which is him ſelfe, and ſo can no more ſinne (vvhich is to ſweruе from his reaſon) then he can deny him ſelfe, or goe from him ſelfe. Laſtly ſinne is an auerſion from God, and an offence vvhich highly diſpleaſeth him, and ſo by conſequence, if God could ſinne: he ſhould as it were turne him ſelfe from him ſelfe, and be auerted from him ſelfe, and diſpleaſed with him ſelfe, and ſo he ſhould be ſo farre from endewing others with felicitie, that he ſhould want it him ſelfe, and liue in a continual miſerie, as he muſt needs doe, who hath an auerſion from him ſelfe, and is diſpleaſed with him ſelfe.

Pſal. 113.
Th. 1 *p. q.* 19 *a.* 4.
The fourth.
Th. 1 *p. q.* 62. *ar.* 1. *in Cor.*
The fifth.

5. But Caluin ſayth that although God be the authour of ſinne, yet he is no ſinner, becauſe he worketh it for a good end. As for example (ſayth he) of the ſame ſinne vvhich the Chaldees committed in vniuſtly afflicting Iob, God was the autour, Sathan was the autour, and the wil of man was the autour: but becauſe God was the autour of it for a good end, to wit, for the exerciſing of Iobs patience, he ſinned not in that action, but did wel and iuſtly in the ſame action, in vvhich they ſinned, and traſgreſſed. But this is no good anſvver. For firſt, if God may be the autour of ſinne to exerciſe the patience of the iuſt, or to chaſtice the wicked, he may alſo be the autour of a lye, for the puniſhment of ſinnes, and ſo Scriptures muſt loſe their credit, becauſe peraduenture they are lyes, which God hath put in the tongue and penne of Moyſes, other Prophets, and the Euangeliſts, for a good end: that is to ſhew his iuſtice in the Iewes and Gentils, whom for a

l. 2. 6. 4. *ſect.* 2. *Caluins anſvver refuted.*

iuſt puniſhment he hath ſeduced, and deceiued with a falſe writen law, becauſe they would not folow the la v of nature, vvhich he had grauen in their hartes. Secondly to make a ſinner, it is ſufficient if he be the author of ſinne, and a good end or intention wil not excuſe, vvhen the meanes and election are naught. Wherfore if God be the author of ſinne he ſinneth what ſoeuer his intention be. And if a good intention may excuſe, it may alſo excuſe vs, and ſo a man may ſteale to helpe his parentes, or to offer Sacrifice and oblations of his theftes vnto God, and yet God condemneth ſuch offrings and S. Paul ſayth plainly, that *euil things are not to be doone that good therby happen.*

Sinne is not excuſed by ying dour to good end

Rom. 3.

6. But now it is more then tyme to draw nere our concluſion, and therfore out of Caluins blaſphemies I wil deduce theſe illations. The firſt is, that ſuch men if they had liued in Platoes tyme (who by law baniſhed thoſe that would father their ſinnes vpon God) they ſhould not haue bene permitted to haue liued in any citie or common welth. And if that learned Iew Philo had bene appointed their Iudge, he would haue adiudged them to be ſtoned to death. Secondly I gather hereby, that theſe men are not led by the Spirit of God, and their doctrin can not be of God, becauſe it is vnlikely, yea impoſſible, that the Spirit of God ſhould dictate ſuch doctrin, vvhich is ſo iniurious to God, and ſo oppoſite to his goodnes: but rather this doctrin doth proceed from him who ſayd *that he vvould be a lying ſpirit in the mouthes of al falſe Prophets.* Thirdly I gather vvhat litle credit is to be giuen vnto them in other matters, who erre groſſely in this opinion, vvhich the light of reaſon argueth of falſitie, and is as euidently falſe, as it is euident, that tehre is a God.

The firſt illation.

l. 2. de Repub. l. de Agricule

The ſecond.

1. Reg. 12. 2. Paral. 18.

The third.

The ſecond Chapter ſhevveth, hovv their doctrin maketh God not only a ſinner, but alſo the only ſinner.

l. 3 Inſt. c. 23. 6

IT is the opinion of Iohn Caluin and of Caluiniſts that God is not only the authour of ſinne, but that his wil & power alſo doth ſo dominere ouer the wil of a ſinner, that he can not reſiſt Gods motion, which eggeth and vrgeth him to ſinne, but muſt of neceſſitie ſinne. Yea, I (ſaith Caluin) *vvil not doubt to confeſſe*

ſimply

simply vvith Austin (he should haue sayd vvithout Austin, for S. Augustin hath no such thing in the palce alleaged) *that the vvil of God is a necessitie of things, and that vvhat he vvilleth, must of necessitie come to passe.* Sithence then God vvilleth al our sinnes, as Caluin hath in the former chapter confessed, it foloweth that we of necessitie sinne, because *Gods vvil is a necessty of things.* He affirmeth also (as is already declared in the last chapter) that the diuil in soliciting and tempting vs, is the instrument of God, and the executor of his wil and determination, and consequently it is Gods wil that he should tempt vs, and seing that as Caluin sayth his wil is a *necessitie of things*, it foloweth also that the diuel of necessitie tempteth vs. *Sect. 1.*

2. Out of vvhich premises foloweth euidently my intended conclusion, to wit, that God only is the sinner. For if God so forcebly moueth the diuil by his owne wil and ordinance that the diuil can not choose but tempt vs, and if the wil of God doth so ouerrule and presse the wil of man, that vvhen God wil haue him sinne (as Caluin sayth he wil) he can not resist, it must neds folow that God is the only sinner, and that man and the diuil are to be excused. For, as Caluin affirmeth, God is the authour of al sinnes, and consequently is a sinner, because his good intention can not excuse him, as is already proued in the last chapter: neither can God alleage necessitie for an excuse, because there is none vvhich boweth his vvil by force, but he him selfe most frankely & friely willeth & worketh our sinnes: & seing that the diuil as Gods instrument is violently, at least necessarily moued to tempt vs, he can not sinne, because he can not iustly be blamed, for that vvhich he could not auoide: and for as much as mans wil is compelled to sinne by the ouerruling wil of God, he also for the same reason can not sinne, and so God is the only sinner, & man and the diuil are innocentes, worthily to be excused, & in no wise to be counted sinners.

Caluin maketh God the only sinner.

And man & the diuel no sinners.

The third Chapter sheuueth, houu their doctrin, that the commandementes are impoßible, maketh God an unreaſonable Prince.

IT is a common Maxime amongſt the Goſpellers, that the commandementes of God are impoſſible, and that a man can as ſoone touch the heauens with his finger, as fulfil the leaſt commandement. Luther ſayth, that when the Scripture vſeth theſe vvords or the like: *If thou vvilt keepe the commandementes*; or, *kepe the commandementes*, God dealeth vvith vs as the mother dalyeth with her infant. For as ſhe calleth her child to her, not in earneſt, becauſe ſhe knoweth wel that he can not walke, but to make him to ſee his owne imbecilitie, and to ſhevv his deſire to come vnto her: ſo when God biddeth vs kepe the commandementes, according to Luther, he ieſteth with vs, and biddeth vs obſerue the law, not for that he thinketh we are able, but becauſe he wil make vs know our owne impotencie, and yet to ſhew our good vvil and deſire to kepe his lawes, if we were able. But this a ſtrange ieſting and dalying, vvhen God wil command vs things impoſſible, to make vs know our inſufficiencie, and yet wil damne vs eternally if vve obſerue not theſe his commandementes. Caluin ſayth plainly, that the lavv is impoſſible, and therfore was neuer fulfilled by any; and he giueth a reaſon, becauſe (ſayth he) *it is hindred by the ordinance and decree of God, that it ſhal not be fulfilled.* And if you obiect that Chriſt ſayed vnto the young man: *If thou vvilt enter into life kepe the commandementes*: Caluin vvil anſwere, that Chriſt ſayd ſo, not that he thought he could kepe them, but becauſe he would repreſſe his pride in propoſing a thing which he could not do. As if Caluin ſhould vaunte that he is a new Apoſtle, and one ſhould ſay vnto him to repreſſe his vanitie, if thou art an Apoſtle, worke I pray thee ſome miracles, for proofe of thy Apoſtleſhip, which he can not do. And if you againe reply that the young man ſayed that he *had obſerued the commandements from his youth.* Caluin wil be ſo bold as to tel him that he lyed: which Chriſt himſelfe would not ſay, though he knevv better then Caluin, how truly he auouched that he had

l. de ſeruo arbitrio.

Luther ſayth the commandements are impoßible.

A ſtrange ieſting.

l. 2. Inſt. c. 7. ſect. 2.

So doth Caluin.

Mat. 19.

Caluin in har Ibidem.

Ibidem.

had kept the commandementes: and S. Marke sayth, that our Sauiour *loued him*, which is at least some argument, that Caluin lyeth in saying that he lyed, because Christ loueth neither lyes nor lyers: *For to God is odious the impious and his impietie.* Sap. 18.

2. I could here vse many arguments to *proue that the commandementes are not impossible.* And might beginne with the old Testament, & thence proue that the Iewes were able to kepe the commandementes, and consequently that much more Christians are able, because that on them God bestoweth his grace more liberally. For after that God had giuen vnto that people the law and *Decalogue* he in diuerse places telleth them, that he commandeth them not to do more then they are able. *The commandement* (sayth God) *which this day I command thee, is not aboue thee, nor placed farre from thee*, not in heauen nor beyond sea, that thou mayest pretend an excuse: *but my speach is very nere thee, in thy mouth, in thy hart, that thou mayst do it.* To this subscribeth our Sauiour Christ the law giuer of the new law, telling vs that *if we will enter into life, we must kepe the commandementes.* And lest we should excuse our selues by a pretence that his commandements are impossible, he preuenteth vs saying, that his *yoke is sweete and his burden light.* And S. Iohn his louing and beloued Disciple auoucheth that *his commandmentes are not heauy.* Now if the commandements be impossible then are they as farre out of our reach and power, as if they were in *heauen or beyond sea*, then are they not *nere vs*, then are they not so at hand, that God may say, that they *are in our mouth, and hart, to do and fulfil them.* For what is farther of then that which is cleane out of our reach and power? If the law be impossible, then it is not a *light burden.* For what can be more heauy, then that which we can not beate at al. But to me this only argument semeth sufficient to stoppe Caluins mouth: that if the commandements were impossible, God should be the most vnreasonable Prince in the world.

The commãdments proued to be possible.

Exod. 20.

Deut. 30.

Rom. 10.

Mat. 19.

Mat. 11.

1. Io. 5.

3. Neither sufficeth it, which Caluin alleageth, that although the commandements be impossible, yet God hath reason to command them, to shew vs our infirmitie, and to prouoke vs to shew our willing mynd to do what we can: for this would not excuse God from being vnreasonable, because at least in that ouerplus which excedeth our power, he should shewe him selfe vnreasonable. As for exãple, if a king would commãd a creeple to folow him, though therby he might make him see his owne impotencie, & geue him occasion by motion of his body, to declare his desire to folow, yet if he cõmãd him in dede to folow,

Caluins answer reiected.

to folow, he is very vnreasonable. Or if Caluin wil say that God wil seme only to command vs, because he would make vs to see our imbecilitie, and to do vvhat vve can, at least to shew our desire, then soloweth it, that there are no commandments, because God doth not verily command them, but semeth only to command, to make vs see our owne infirmitie, and to shew our desire. Or if Caluin wil not be so bold as to deny al commandements, then must he grant that God is vnreasonable, in commanding vs more then we are able to performe. As for example, if the master would command his seruant not only to runne, but also to fly on his arrand, and for a shorter cut to leape ouer a riuer, ouer vvhich he can scarsely see: would you not thinke him vnreasonable, and quite beside him selfe? The like doth Almighty God, if we beleeue Caluin, for he commandeth vs to loue him aboue al, and our neighbour as our selues, he biddeth vs not to steale, not to kil, yea not to couet our neighbours wife, or goods, vvhich is as if he should command vs to fly, or to moue mountaines, or to leape ouer the sea: because these thinges in Caluins opinion, are no more impossible, then are the commandements, and therfore in these commandementes God sheweth him selfe as vnreasonable, as man should do in the other.

An other example.

4. Yea if once we grant that God may command impossibilities, then is there no reason why brute beastes may not be commanded not to kil one an other, not to liue of spoile, to faste sometymes, and to honour yea loue their Creatour: because God commandeth man to do these thinges, who yet is no more able to do them, then beastes are. And if beastes could speake and would tel Almightie God, that he hath no reason to command them to do these thinges, because they are not in their power, then may men make the same exception, and accuse their Creator as a Prince most vnreasonable, who commandeth them to execute those lawes, which they no more can fulfil then oxen, and asses can do. And if God wil condemne them as guiltie of offence, for not obeying his commandments they may answer with S. Chrisostome: *Si impotentes nos fecit & deinde imperat, culpa eius est: If he hath made vs impotent* (as Caluin sayth he hath, because by his decree and ordinance he hindreth vs or at least, if we be already by Adams sinne made impotent) *and yet he commandeth vs, the* fault is his, and not ours if we trasgresse his commandement.

Hovv .16. in ep. Heb. Sepra l. 2. Institu. c. 7 sect. 5

The

The fourth Chapter shewveth, howv the former doctrin maketh God a most cruel tyrant.

CERDON that infamous heretike, and diuers of his folowers, reading in the old testament, vvhat seueritie in that law God had sometymes vsed, and not considering that the enormitie of sinne is such, that it deserueth not only temporal, but also æternal death, and imagining that such seueritie could not procede from the good God, who is goodnes it selfe (as though God vvere merciful, and not iust also) they affirmed, that there were two Gods the one good, the other cruel, the one the author of the old testamēt, the other of the new, the one Creator only of superior substances, the other of this infetior vvorld. Against these men S. Austin wrote a booke entitled *Against the aduersarie of the lavv and Prophetes*, in vvhich he proueth that in the new law God hath shewed as great seueritie, to wit, in the death of Ananias & Saphira, in threatening eternal damnation (which passeth al temporal punishement) against those that shal not giue almes, and not only against those that shal kil, but also against them that shalbe angrie, and shal cal contumeliously their brother foole. Whence it foloweth that one and the selfe same God is seuere and sweete, iust and merciful. And good reason, for as the king must not only be gentle but iust also, & therfore the Ægiptians Hierogliffe of a King, was a Bee, vvhose hony signifieth the swetnes vvhich ought to be in a Prince, and his sting importeth, that he must be withal seuere: & iust also, where mercie and faire meanes wil not serue: so God the king of kinges offereth his grace most frankely and bestoweth benefites on vs bountifully, & many tymes winketh at our faultes & expecteth patiently amendment and repentance: but if we contemne his benefites and abuse his patience, then doth he lay his hand seuerely vpon vs, because as he is good so is he iust, and must be iust, else were he not God.

Ex Ter. li. prasc. c. 12.

Cerdons tvvo Gods the one good the other euil.

Act. 3.

Mat. 25 & 5.

Goſt is iuſt & merciful.

A ſimilitude

2. And although some, respecting only the shortenes of the pleasure vvhich they haue taken in sinne, thinke it hard to be punished eternally for a momentarie pleasure: yet if they consider what it is to offend

offend ſo great a Maieſtie, and how when we ſinne, we do in affection deſire eternally to perſeuer in that ſinne, and pleaſure or commoditie, we wil thinke with S. Gregorie that the ſinner who hath ſinned in his eternitie, ſhould be puniſhed in Gods eternitie? Yea if Princes for a momentarie tranſgreſſion may iuſtly pnniſh their ſubiectes with perpetual exile and death it ſelfe, vvhich of it ſelfe is perpetual, becauſe reſurrection is ſupernatural: why may not God iuſtly puniſh vs with eternal paines, for our temporal faultes, eſpecially ſeing that they vvhich dye in mortal ſinne, neuer thinke of repentance, but remain perpetually obſtinate in their malice, and ſo deſerue to be perpetually puniſhed, becauſe ſinne as long as it remaineth, is vvorthy paine, and therfore remaining for euer it may iuſtly be puniſhed for euer and euer? But although it be ſo that there are not two gods as Cerdon ſayd, the one meeke and mylde, the other cruel and churliſh: and although the ſelfe ſame God, and the good and the only God, be and muſt be, becauſe he is God, merciful and iuſt, and conſequently gentle and ſeuere without al crueltie, becauſe iuſtice is no crueltie: yet if we wil auouch Luthers and Caluins doctrin for currant, we muſt of neceſſitie confeſſe, that God is the cruelleſt tyrant that euer vvas or can be.

l. 4. dial. c. 66.

3. For they affirme, as we haue related in the former chapter, that God commandeth vs thinges altogether impoſſible: and they can not deny but that for tranſgreſſing theſe commandementes, the wicked are tormented in hel perpetually (for Chriſt biddeth *them goe accurſed into euerlaſting fyre*, who clothed him not in his members, vvhen he was in them naked, and who fed him not vvhen in them he was hungrie) vvhich if it be ſo, then is God moſt cruel and barbarous. Luther once wel perceiued, that this conſequence, to wit, that God is cruel, followed euidently out of their ſaid premiſes, that the commandments are impoſſible: and vvhat thinke you doth he anſwer, or how doth he frie Gods goodnes from crueltie? he ſaith *that by light of nature and grace, it is vnſoluble. hovv God damneth him vvho can not choſe but ſinne and tranſgreſſe, and* here (ſayth he) *both the light of nature and grace do tel vs, that the fault is in God only, and not in miſerable man: but by the light of glorie* (vvhich the bleſſed enioy) *Gods iuſtice herein is manifeſted, vvhich novv ſeemeth to be iuſtice.* Yea (ſayth he) *Gods iuſtice in this point is novv incomprehenſible.* So that Luther ſayth that now neither by light of nature nor of grace that is fayth (for ſo I thinke is his meaning in his obſcure diſtinction) we can excuſe God from iniuſtice and crueltie, who commandeth things

Mat. 25.

l. de ſeruo arbitrio.

Ibidem.

thinges impoſſible vvhich we can not performe, and yet puniſheth offenders æternally.

4. And truly if it be ſo as they ſay, that God commandeth impoſſibilities and yet puniſheth and damneth the tranſgreſſors, then not only by the light of nature and grace, but by al light and reaſon imaginable it is manifeſt that God is moſt cruel and tyrannical. For if that maiſter be cruel and barbarous, who commandeth his ſeruant that is lame to runne or leape, and becauſe he doth not ſo, beateth him blacke and blew, breaketh his bones, and in fine killeth him alſo, then certes God him ſelfe who commandeth vs impoſſibilites, and for not doing them doth not only puniſh temporally, but alſo damneth men perpetually, and condemneth to thoſe æternal flames of hel, vvhere they ſhal euer feele the panges of death and yet neuer dye, where they ſhal alwayes be dying & neuer dead, vvhere after millions of yeares of impriſonment & torment, they ſhalbe neuer awhit the nearer an end of their miſerie: he I ſay muſt neds be moſt cruel and inhumain, more barbarous then any Scithian and ſo tyrannical, that in reſpect of him, Nero, Domitian, and Dioniſius, were no tyrants but rather clement Princes.

An example of a Tirant.

God according to Luth. & Caluī is the moſt cruel Tyrant that euer vvas.

The fift chapter maketh it manifeſt, that the reformers pul the true God out of his throne, & place an Idol in the ſame, of their ovvne imagination.

TErtullian that ancient and learned writer when he was beſt diſpoſed (that is vvhen he was a Catholique and a writer againſt heretikes, in defence of the Catholique and Romain Church and Religion) was of opinion that al hereſies are idolatries, and al heretikes idolaters. Which opinion though at the firſt ſight, it may ſeeme to rigorous, yea erronious, yet if it be wel wayed and conſidered, it may very truly be verified of the heretikes of his tyme, and of this our vnhappy age, and in ſome ſorte of al heretikes vvhat ſoeuer. But before we come to the proofe of this his opinion, we wil firſt ſet it downe in his ovvne vvords, vvhich are theſe: *Either they faine an other God to the Creator* (as the Marcioniſtes did) *or if they*

Heretikes are Idolaters.

l præſc. c. 42.

or if they confesse the only Creator, they declare him otherwise then in dede he is: so euery error concerning God is in some sorte a variation of Idolatrie. By which appeareth, that in his opinion euery heresie is a kind of Idolatrie.

2. And truly there is no heresie but either directly or indirectly it denyeth the true God. For either it denyeth some thing in God, and then it directly denyeth God, or it denyeth some thing which pertaineth vnto God, and so indirectly and by a certain consequence, it taketh away the true God. As for example: the Marcionites affirmed that God was cruel, and that the good God was not Creator of this inferior world, which conteineth the fowre elementes, and al those thinges which are compounded of them: and seing that there is no such God who is cruel, or who is not the Creator of the whole world, they denyed the true God and confessed an Idol of their own imagination. In like maner the Arians denied, that God the Father had a Sonne coequal and consubstantial vnto him, & seing that the true God is one God, which is the Father the Sonne and the Holy Ghost, the Arians in denying the second Person to be God coequal with the Father, denyed the true God: because the true God is not distinct in nature from God the Sonne, and they adored an Idol of their owne imagination, that is, a God who hath no Sonne, or not coequal and consubstantial vnto him. Wherfore Athanasius complaineth that the Arrians vnder pretence of religion, had brought in Idolatrie, and abandoned Baptisme, which can not be equally ministred in the name of the Father the Sonne and the Holy Ghost, if those three Persons be not al equal in Deitie and dignitie.

Some heresies deny God directly.

Examples.

Ser. 1. & 4. cõt. Arianos.

3. Other heretikes there were which held no error concerning the Diuinitie or any Diuine Person, & so could not be sayed, directly to deny the true God, but yet indirectly they denyed him by denying some veritie which hath a cõiunction with him. As for example, Nouatianus, who sayd that there was no remedie against sinne after Baptisme, directly only denyed the Sacrament of Penance, but yet indirectly and by a certain consequence he denyed God, because he is not a true God, which wil not accept of penance after Baptisme, and therfore seing that he confessed only such a God, he adored a false God, and so was an Idolater. Nestorius also who sayd, that in Christ besides the Diuine Person, there was also an humane person, and consequently two persons, directly denyed the vnitie of Christs Person, and affirmed two persons in Christ: but indirectly he denyed Christ and consequently God, because Christ is God and man in one and the selfe same

Other indirectly.

Examples.

ſame Perſon, & therfore he denying Chriſt conſiſting of two perſons, adored a falſe Chriſt, and conſequently a falſe God, and ſo was in Idolatrie. S. Thomas giueth the reaſon of this: becauſe (ſayth he, and he alleageth Ariſtotle for authoritie) God is a thing infinit in perfection, yet ſo ſimple and void of compoſition, that in him is no diſtinction but of Perſons, vvhich alſo are one indiuiſible God, and therfore as an indiuiſible point is altogether touched, or not at al, becauſe it hath no partes, ſo our vnderſtanding either rightly attaineth vnto the knowledge of God, or not at al, and if it erre in one perfection of God it erreth in al, becauſe al is one. And ſo if an heretique denieth any thing of God, he denyeth al. 22.q.2.a 2.ad 1.l.9 met. *The reaſon.*

4. But although al heretikes are in ſome ſorte Idolaters, yet I wil not deny but that there is a difference betwixt them, and paganes. For theſe men deny the true God in expreſſe termes, and adore ſome creature for God, as Iupiter, or the planetes, or ſome ſuch like: but heretikes only affirme ſome thing of God, vvhich implyeth a denyal of the true God, yet they profeſſe in wordes religion vnto the true God. Now therfore if al heretikes be in ſome ſorte Idolaters, then certainly the heretikes of this tyme are eſpecially Idolaters. For they (as is already proued) ſay that God is the author of ſinne, and their doctrin implieth that he is of a bad nature, vnreaſonable, and cruel, wherfore ſeing that there is no ſuch God, they confeſſe & adore not a true God, but an Idol of their owne coceipt and fiction, and ſo are Idolaters, who pul the true God, vvhich is a good God, not cruel, nor vnreaſonable, nor author of ſinne, out of his throne, and place therin a falſe God, an Idol of their owne imagination.

THE SIXT BOOKE CONTAINETH A SVRVEY OF THEIR DOCTRIN CONCERNING PRINCES AVTHORITIE and their lavves, in vvhich is proued, that the doctrin of the reformers, despoileth princes of authoritie, and bringeth their lavves in contempt.

The first chapter shevveth hovv in that they say, that no Prince can bynd a man in conscience to obey his lavv and commandment, they despoile princes of authoritie and superioritie, and giue the subiects good leaue to rebel and reuolte.

Eccl. 13.

BY experience vve see, and holy Scripture teacheth, that like of nature do easily sorte themselues together. Shepe do flocke to one fold, deere meet together in one parke, bees in one svvarme, and fovles of one fether do flye together, and fishes of one finne, do swime together. The reason may be, because like of nature are like in conditions, and so do more easily symbolize and agree together, and one alone hath no helpe but of him selfe, and therfore for mutual aide and comforte, they accompanie them selues with others. But amongst al liuing creatures man especially is ciuil and compaignable, and therfore is *called animal sociabile, a sociable creature.* For first man is apt to language, by which

Th de Regim. princip. l. 4. c. 2. 3.

Man especially is sociable.

The first reaso

by vvhich he desireth to expresse his mynd to others, and therfore if he vvil haue any vse of his tongue and facultie of speaking, he must liue in company. Secondly man especially is disciplinable, desirous to learne of others, and by discoursing and deuising, to knovvvvhat other men thinke and conceaue. For as he is vvilling to impart his owne conceites, so is he desirous to be partaker of the knowledge and cogitation of others, which his desire he can not satisfie vnles he repaire to company. Thirdly man only amongst al liuing creatures is apt to frendship, that is to loue and to be beloued, and because loue cometh by sight, and sure frendship is not gotten but by much familiaritie, and long experience, he can not attaine to this also, but in company and societie. Lastly man only is borne naked, where as in other liuing creatures, garmentes do grow with them, destitute of al weapons of defence, vvhere as the bul hath his horne, the backe his head, the horse his hoofe, the bore his tuske, and euery one hath one vveapon or other to defend and offend. Wherfore seing that man is so destitute, that being alone he wanteth many commodities, he must fly to societie vvhere one helpeth an other, and because euery countrie beareth not al thinges, one countrie must trafique with an other, and hence procedeth societie. Wherfore no sooner were men created, but they assembled them selues together, first in families, then in townes and cities, & afterwards as their number increased, in common weales and kingdomes. And although the Poets fayne that Orpheus was the first vvho with his melodious tunes called men together, yet certain it is, that euen from the beginning men liued in societie, induced thervnto by no other Orpheus, then Nature, and God the author of nature.

The second.

The third.

The fourth.

Vvho assembled men together, at the first.

2. Now as the natural body of man is framed by God and nature of diuers members vnited together, and hath from God and Nature authoritie to defend it selfe against al, that shal vniustly seeke to molest or iniurie the same: so the ciuil body of a societie of men, be it a Kingdom ro other comonwelth, receiued from god and nature authoritie and power to conserue it selfe, and to vvithstand al foreiners, who shal iniuriously inuade it. For if nature did not geue men authoritie to defend and preserue them selues in societie, in vaine, yea not in vaine only, but also perniciously, and to mans great preiudice, had God and nature enclined him to liue in companie. Wherfore al societies lawfully assembled, haue from God and nature, power and authoritie to rule and defend them selues: and because the confused multitude is

Euerie lavvful societie hath authoritie to defend itselfe.

The reason vvhy.

tude is vnfit to gouerne, becauſe it is *bellua multorum capitum*, *a beaſt of many heades*, wauering, inconſtant, and mutinous (yea hard it is for the multitude to mete alwaies together to determine vpon ſtate, matters, and vvhen they are met they can as hardly agree) it was neceſſarie that this multitude ſhould haue authoritie, to chooſe ſome head or heades, by vvhich this ciuil body might be directed, ruled, and defended. Hence it is that diuines yea Scriptures affirme, that al lawful authoritie vvhich Princes and Superiors haue ouer others, is of God; becauſe it procedeth from the peoples election, who as they were by God and nature inclined to liue in ſocietie, ſo they receiued authoritie to rule, and defend them ſelues, vvhich becauſe they could not do by them ſelues, they receiued alſo authoritie from God and nature to appointe rulers and gouerners; and ſo al lawful gouerneis are appointed by God, by meanes of election, and therfore they *vvho reſiſt them, reſiſt Gods ordinance*. And although now for the moſt part Princes come to authoritie by ſucceſſion, yet the origen alſo of this procedeth from election, becauſe the people, to auoyed inconueniences vvhich might happen, if after the death of their Prince, they ſhould be to ſeeke for an other, were content vvhen they choſe the firſt Prince, that al his lawful heires, ſhould after him ſucced in the ſame authority.

Rom.13. Vicerelec. de poteſt. ciuili. Hovv al authoritie is of God.

Rom. 16.

3 Now if the Prince haue not authoritie to command and bynd his ſubiectes alſo in conſcience to obey his commandment, then in vaine is he head and Prince of the people, becauſe if he command and yet the ſubiectes may chooſe whether they wil obey or not, then no order can be eſtabliſhed, and as good no head at al as ſuch a head. Wherfore holy Scripture telleth vs that Princes may command and ſubiectes in conſcience muſt obey, and *giue to Cæſar vvhat is devv to Cæſar*. S. Paul ſayth that *euerie ſoule muſt be ſubiect to higher povvers*: and he giueth the reaſon, becauſe (ſayth he) *there is no povver but of God, and therfore they vvho reſiſt povver, reſiſt Gods ordinance and purchaſe to them ſelues damnation*. Yet ſayth he: *of neceſſitie be you ſubiect not only for diſpleaſure, but alſo for conſcience*. And afterwards he biddeth vs to pay tributes, and ſubſidies vnto Princes, becauſe they are the miniſters of God appointed by him. S. Peter alſo biddeth vs to *be ſubiect to euery humaine creature for God*, that is to euery magiſtrate and temporal ſuperior; vvhom he calleth humaine creatures, becauſe their authoritie is in temporal and humain thinges. And therfore he addeth, as it were to ſpecifie vvhat he meaneth by the humain creature: *vvhether it be to the King, as excelling, or the Rulers ſent from him. &c.* Yea he biddeth vs obey not only gentle and courteous maiſters,

Mat 22. Rom. 13. Ibidem. 1. Pet. 2.

maisters, but euen those vvhich are *hard to please*. And this obedience these Apostles command vs to giue to Princes although they be Infidels, if otherwise they be lawful, for vvhen the Apostles wrote, there were no Christian Princes, and faith is not necessarie to iurisdiction, neither is authoritie lost by the only losse of faith. But yet this must be vnderstood, vvhen Princes command within the limits of their iurisdiction: for otherwise, if they command vs any thing against God or conscience, we must answer them, as the Apostles answered the Iewes, *vve must obey God before men*. Because Princes are appointed by God, and so can command nothing, vvhich is against God: or if they do, we must obey the supreme Prince before the inferior, and the King before his viceroy. Wherfore S. Policarpe although he refused to obey the Proconsul who commanded him to do that vvhich was against God, Religion, and conscience, yet he sayd: *Vve are taught to giue to principalities and Potentates ordained by God, that honour vvhich is devv to them, and not hurtful to vs*. This being so, that Princes haue authoritie to command, and to bynd also in conscience to obedience & that from God vvhose ministers they are, and *by vvhom* (as the wise man sayth) *Kinges do raigne, and the lavv makers determe vvhat is iust*: it remaineth that we examin our aduersaries doctrin in this point, that we may see vvhat they giue to superioritie, authoritie, and higher powers.

Ex Euseb.

Prou. 2.

4. But peraduenture some wil thinke that this is a vaine examination, because they are so farre from suspicion of detracting from Princes authoritie, that rather they seme to grant them to much. Luther affirmeth that Bishops and Prelates are subiect to the Emperour euen in Ecclesiastical causes, and that Ecclesiastical iurisdiction is deriued from temporal. And vvhen Catholiques in England refuse to go the Church, because profession is made there of a religion contrarie to theirs, the reformers vrge nothing so much as that we must obey Princes, and their Iniunctions. But this they do only vvhen Ecclesiastical power calleth them to an account, or when the Princes lawes do fauorize their doctrin: for then they flatter Princes, and preferre their authoritie before the Church: not because in hart they reuerence their authoritie, but because by their power, they would establish their heresie So Arius by the meanes of Eusebius Bishop of Nicomedia, first insinuated him selfe to Constantia the Sister of Constantin the great: and by him he got audience of Constantin him selfe, and by flattery and dissimulation he procured a commandment from the Emperour to Athanasius, to receiue him againe into the Church. And

Ar. 27.

Vvhen heretikes acknovvlege authoritie.

To vvhat end.

Arius flatterie of Princes.

Ruff. l. 1. c. 11.

afterwards he crept by this meanes into credit with Constantius the Arian Emperour and sonne to Constantin, by vvhom he banished Catholique Bishops, called many Councels, & propagated his heresie: in so much that S. Hierom sayth *Arrius vt orbem deciperet, sororem principis ante decepit Arrius that he might deceiue the vvorld first deceiued the sister of the Prince.* They curried fauour also with Iulian the Apostata, and they offered their seruice to Iouinian the Emperour, but he vvould none of their proferd seruice, knowing that they vsed to flatter Princes for promotion of their heresies. So that one Themistius a Philosopher vvas wont to say, that heretikes adore the Purple, not God: and are as mutable as Euripus. Luther backed also by the Duke of Saxonie contemned the Popes legate, who sought to reclaime him, and preached confidently those heresies which otherwise he durst not haue done, and perseuered obstinately in them also, vvhich otherwise peraduenture he would not haue done. Caluin sought by a flattering epistle to procure fauour and credit with the French King: and our English Protestantes by the fauour of the late Quene got credit amongst the people, and graced heresie with her crowne. And to winne this fauour they wil not sticke to flatter Princes, yea to adore them and to giue them higher Titles and greater power, then euer God bestowed vpon them. In king Edwards tyme vvhen the state fauoured them, they acknowledged him Supreme head not only in temporal, but also in Ecclesiastical causes. In Quene Maries tyme becausse that Princesse vvas not for them, then women could not gouerne: but in Quene Elizabeth tyme, becausse they had insinuated them selues into her protection, women might gouerne as wel as men: and so they are the best temporizers in the vvorld.

Ep. ad Ctesiph — *The Arians flattrie.* — *Vvhat temporizers they are* — *Luth. bakled.* — *Præfat. Inst. ad Reg. Gall.* — *Caluins flatterie.* — *Protestantes flatterie of Princes.*

5 But if you marke their procedings, or doctrin, you shal see that they honor not authoritie, but loue their heresies: which if Princes wil not like, then they contemne and despise al authoritie, & wil not let to make a mutinie, and stirre vp the subiects to rebellion. Luther exhorteth the Germanes not to take armes against the Turke, *becausse the Turke for pollicie, consaile, integritie and moderation excelleth al our Princes.* And in the same place he calleth the Emperour Charles the fifte, *a rotten and fraile carcasse.* And in his booke against the king of England, he calleth him blocke heade, foole, and by manie other worse names. In an other booke he not only inueigheth against Princely authoritie, but also calleth them al fooles, knaues, tirãtes. In an other booke which he wrote against the two Edicts of the Emperour, he calleth the Princes of the

to. 2. post duo Edicta Cæsar. — *Luthers contempt of authoritie.* — *l. cont. Reg. Angliæ.*

of the Empire fooles, madmen, furious, tenne tymes worse then the Turke. Of which doctrin and example Thomas Munster taking hold, with an hundred thousand rustickes, trubled al Germanie, and in one Franconie he destroied two hundred nyntie three Monasteries. The Lutheran Princes also armed with this example of Luther, tooke armes against the Emperour, and therby were the cause that the Turke surprised many townes, and strong fortes of the Christians. And what stirres the Caluinistes and other sectes haue made in France, Scotland, and the lovve countries, al the vvorld knovveth, and Flanders to this day feeleth.

l de potestate seculari.
Sur. an. 1525. Munslers sacecage.
The Lutheran Princes cause of the Turkes entrance.
Sur. 1530. & 1566.
Caluinistes garboiles.

6. And truly this contempt of lavvful Princes, this disloyaltie & rebellion, is altogether according to their doctrin. Luther in his comment vpon the first Epistle of S. Peter sayth plainly, that he vvil not be compelled, nor bond to obey any prophane magistrate, because he vvil not loose his libertie, which is to be fried in conscience from al Princes authoritie: yet he sayth he vvil obey them friely and frankely, but not of any obligation. And afterwards explicating those words: *Honour the Kinge*: sayth, that if the Pope as a temporal Prince should command any to weare a friers hood, to shaue his crovvne, or to fast certaine dayes (as Luther did before his apostasie) that he should obey him, but yet of frie choyse, as a temporal Prince (which yet I doubt whether Luther would do but (sayth he) if he command thee in the name of God, vnder paine of excommunication and mortal sinne: *Tum dicas, bona verba, sitis mihi propitius domine Papa, equidem quod mandatis nullus fecero. Then say, Be good in your offfice, be good vnto vs Sir Pope, vvhat you command I vvil not doe.* And he giueth you a reason in the next words: *To higher powers it behoueth vs to be subiect, so long as they bind not our consciences.* So that Luther is of opinion that though we must for order sake obey Princes & magistrates, yet we are frie in conscience, & can not in conscience vnder paine of sinne be bond to any temporal or Ecclesiastical authoritie. Caluin subscribeth to him in al pointes touching this matter, for hauing made a long discourse about Christian libertie, he concludeth in this maner: *Vve conclude that they are exempted from al powver of men.* And lest this might semeto haue escaped him vnaduisedly, in the next booke he repeateth it again diuerse tymes: *Our consciences haue not to doe vvith men but God only.* And again: *Paul in novvise suffereth faithful consciences to be brought into bondage of men.* Yet Caluin in the same places fearing to displease Princes, exhorteth vs to do as they shal command vs, not of any obligation because Christ (sayth he) hath fried

Luther taketh avvay obediẽce to Princes.
Luther absolueth vs in cõscience from obedience to Princes.
l. 3 6. 29. 10. So doth Caluĩ.
Caluĩ cõtrarie to himselfe.

vs from al the lawes of men but of frie choice and libertie; ſo not for conſcience, but for common peace. In which wordes he is cleane oppoſit to S. Paul, vvho ſayth that of neceſſitie we muſt be ſubiect not *only for fear of diſpleaſure, but for conſcience.* Rom. 13.

7. Out of this doctrin I inferre as a moſt euident concluſion, that in vaine Princes haue authoritie ouer their ſubiectes: for if the ſubiect may chuſe whether he wil obey or no, then the prince may command and he may anſwer, that as he is not bond to obey becauſe by Chriſtian libertie he is fried from al mens lawes, ſo he vvil not at this tyme obey, and ſo in vayne ſhal the Prince command. Secondly I conclude out of Luthers and Caluins premiſes, that there are no Princes nor Superiors ouer Chriſtians, and conſequently that al Chriſtian Princes are vſurpers, becauſe they chalenge Superioritie and authoritie ouer Chriſtians, vvhich in dede they haue not, and wil nedes be Princes and Superiors, vvho are but priuate men. For if they can not ſo command vs as to bynd vs to obedience, then are we not ſubiect to them, and conſequently they are no Superiors: and although we may obey them, of frie choiſe, yet that maketh them not our Superiors, becauſe ſo we may obey our equal and inferior if we wil: yet becauſe he can not bynd vs in conſcience to obey, he hath not authoritie ouer vs, and we in that we are frie are not ſubiect to him. And wheras they affirme, that yet we muſt frankelie and friely, not for conſcience but for order ſake, and for auoiding ſcandale, obey our Kinges and Princes: I demand of them, what they meane by that (muſt)? If they meane an obligation in conſcience, then in that caſe lawes bynd in conſcience, and their doctrin is falſe. If they meane only a congruitie, then neither for keping order, nor for auoiding ſcandal are we bond in conſcience to obey Princes authoritie: whence foloweth, that to diſoby Princes is no ſinne, but an incongruitie, & ſo in conſcience we are not ſubiect to their authoritie, and conſequently they are no Snperiors. Which that it may the more plainly appeare, we muſt note that a Superior and ſubiect are correlatiues, as are the father and the ſonne, the maiſter and the ſeruant: becauſe as the father is the ſonnes farher, and the maiſter the ſeruãtes maiſter, ſo a Superior is the ſubiectes ſuperior. And as no ſonne no father, no ſeruant no maiſter, ſo no ſubiect no Superior, becauſe correlatiues are of that nature that one inferreth an other, and one can not be vvithout an other.

The firſt concluſion deduced out of the former doctrin.

The ſecond. No Princes by Luthers and Caluins doctrin.

8. Wherfore if al Chriſtians be ſet at ſuch libertie, that they are not bond in conſcience to obey any Princes lawes, then are they not

ſubiect

ſubiect to them, but as frie as he that hath no maiſter: and ſeing that vvhere is no ſubiect, there can not be any Superior, it foloweth, that if Princes can not bynd vs to obey them, we are no ſubiectes, they no Superiors. Is not this gentle reader, to contemne & deny al authoritie and ſuperioritie? And conſequently, is not this to open the gate vnto al mutinie and rebellion? For vvhen the ſubiectes are taught that by Chriſt and Chriſtian faith, they are fried in conſcience from men, and mens authoritie: if the Prince command, they may deny obedience: if he exact tributes, taxes, and ſubſidies, they may chuſe whether they wil pay a peny: and if they like not his gouernment, they may by rebellion frie them ſelues from him, to whom in conſcience and before God they are not ſubiect: becauſe they are frie men, vvho in that they are frie can acknowledge no Maiſter.

Princes are no Princes nor Superiors by the former doctrin.

9. Who wil now blame the ſubiectes in France, Flanders and Germanie, for making rebellion? They did but according to their doctrin, and in refuſing to obey men, they did but vſe that friedom, vvhich Chriſt hath giuen them, which is to be ſubiect to none. Yea who now can do otherwiſe then to commend rebelles for rebellion, and diſcommend al loyal ſubiects? Becauſe in diſobeing and rebelling they ſhew them ſelues to be frie men, and acknowledge Chriſt their Redemer, and in obeying, they make them ſelues ſubiect to men, they vſe not their libertie, and they do iniurie to Chriſt, as though he had not redemed them from al ſeruitude of men. If Princes conſidered wel this doctrin, they would be ſo farre from fauouring theſe new Chriſtians, that they vvould baniſh them their countries. For what aſſurance hath a Prince of ſubiectes ſo perſwaded? or how can he but alwayes ſtād in feare of their rebellion: who by their religion are warranted, that they can not ſinne in rebellion, becauſe they are not bond in conſcience to obey any humaine authoritie.

The ſecond Chapter ſhewueth howu by their precedent doctrin, Iudges and tribunal ſeates are brought in contempt.

AS the Moral vertue Iuſtice was euer highly eſtemed, as the ſtrength of al common welthes: ſo Iudges who are the miniſters of iuſtice (whoſe office is to condéne the nocent, and abſolue the innocente) were euer had in ſuch reuerence, that their ſentence was counted an oracle, and their Seate and Tribunal where they vſed to pronunce ſentence, was reſpected as a ſacred place. Wherfore in Scripture it ſelfe Iudges are called gods, becauſe like lirle gods, vnder God they giue ſentence as his vnder Iudges, and if the ſentence be iuſt, then what they adiudge in earth God ratifieth in heauen. This honourable conceite of Iudges and Tribunals, the doctrin of our reformers alleaged in the former chapter, diminiſheth very much, yea it bringeth them into plaine contempt and condemneth them al of Tyrannie and open iniuſtice. For if Princes haue no authoritie as by the doctrin of theſe nouellantes I haue proued they haue not, then can they giue none vnto their Iudges, and conſequently neither the Prince nor the Iudge hath authoritie, to giue ſentence or to puniſh any malefactors, becauſe if they haue no authoritie they are but priuate men. For although priuate men may *vim vi repellere, repelle force by force*, and ſtand in their ovvne defence, that is warde a blow, when it is offered, and ſtrike rather then be ſtricken, yea kil rather then be killed, becauſe this is but to defend them ſelues, and to repel iniurie: yet after that the iniurie is receiued, and quite paſt, they can not them ſelues requite the euil receiued, with a like euil, becauſe that vvere not to defend, but to reuenge them ſelues, vvhich God hath reſerued to him ſelfe, and to them to whom he hath giuen authoritie, and wil not in anywiſe that priuate men be their ovvne Iudges and reuengers, becauſe that were to open the way to al outrages, much leſſe vvil he permit them to puniſh thoſe that haue done iniuries vnto others. VVherfore if Princes haue no authoritie to command as in the laſt chapter, by this new doctrin I haue proued they haue not, then are they

Pſal. 88.

The reformers doctrin taketh avvay al Tribunals.

Rom. 12.

they priuate men, and ſo can neither reuenge their ovvne nor others iniuries, and conſequently vniuſtly they condemne malefactors to priſon, to death, and other paines and penalties.

2. And truly if it be true vvhich Luther and Caluin and their fo- *See the firſt* lovvers alſo affirme, that no man can bynde vs in conſcience by law *chap.* and commandement, yea if it be good doctrin, vvhich is their doctrin, as in the next booke ſhal be related, that by Chriſt and Chriſtian *Chap. 8.* fayth we are fried from al obligation of Diuine lawes alſo, then the malefactor hath great ſcope giuen him to auoyd the Iudges ſentence, although the offence be manifeſt. For ſuppoſe the Iudge condemne *Hovv a con-* him for tranſgreſſion of the Princes law, he may confeſſe the fault, & *demned man* contemne the ſentence. And firſt he may ſay, that his ſentence can not *is taught by* bynd him in conſcience to accept of it, becauſe by Chriſt he is made *Caluin to a-* a frie man, ſubiect in conſcience neither to man, nor mans lavv nor- *uoid the ſen-* ſentence. Secondly he may confeſſe that he hath done contrarie to *tence.* the kinges law, and yet plead nor guiltie: alleaging that the Princes *The firſt vvay* lavv can not bynd him in conſcience, becauſe he is exempted by *to auoid.* Chriſt, from al humaine lavves and commandements. And then he *The ſecond.* may ſay that vvhere no lavv bynderh in conſcience, there is no obligation, vvhere no oblihation, there is no ſinne, and ſo he may confeſſe the fact and yet plead not guiltie, becauſe he ſinned not. And he may alſo refuſe the puniſhement by ſentence decreed, becauſe where no ſinne is, there no payne is due. Or if the Iudge condemne him for *The third.* breaking Gods lavv in ſtealing, murdering, or ſuch like, he may confeſſe likevviſe the fact, and yet deny the fault, becauſe he is ſo frie, that God his lavv alſo can not bynd him, and ſeing that vvhere no *So ſay. b Luth.* obligation is, there can be no fault (becauſe euerye ſinne is againſt ſo- *in c. 2. & 4.* me bond or obligation) he may claime abſolution from the payne by *ad Gal. l. de* the title of innocencie, becauſe vvhere no ſinne is, there no paine can *libert. Chriſt.* be dew. Yea although he confeſſe that he hath ſinned (which yet he *Calul. 2. inſt.* nede not) in tranſgreſſing Gods law, yet he may eſcape the ſentence *c. 2.* by appeale. For he may ſay, I confeſſe the fault for vvhich I am con- *The fourth.* demned, but I refuſe to ſtand to your ſentence, I appeale to God, let him puniſh me if he wil (vvhich I knovv not how he can do iuſtly if I be frie from his lavves in conſcience) but of your ſentence I vvil not accept, and if you vrge me vvith conſcience, and alleage that I am bond in conſcience, to ſtand to your arbitrement, becauſe you are appointed to do iuſtice, I chalenge Chriſtian friedom, by which I am ſo frie, that in conſcience I am not bond to mans law, nor ſentence.

3. And

3. And if this wil not ſerue to frie him from the ſentence (as I ſee no reaſon why it ſhould not ſerue) then he may defend him ſelfe by other opinions of the new reformers. He may ſay, that by Luthers and Caluins opinions, which are the Patriarches of the reformed Church, he is raught that he hath no frie wil, nor choiſe in any action, vvhich he doth, vvhether it be good or bad, and that therfore the Iudge is vnreaſonable, cruel, and barbarous, in condemning him for theft, murder, or adultrie, vvhich was not in his power to auoyd. And as iuſtly might he condemne him for not flying at the Kinges commandment, as for not abſteining from murder, vvhen either by anger or deſire of money he was moued therunto. He might alleage alſo for his defence, that God moued him vnto thoſe offences, vvhich he committed and ſo forcibly alſo, that he could not reſiſt him, for this is Caluins opinion, as before is declared: yea he might ſay and haue Caluin alſo for his authour, that God was the author and principal agent of the theft or murder, for vvhich he is condemned, and that therfore by good conſequence he can not iuſtly be condemned for that, in vvhich God hath more part then he hath, and to vvhich he moued him ſo forcibly that he could not reſiſt. What is this then (gentle reader) but to condemne al Iudges and tribunal ſeates, to ſtoppe the Iudges mouth from pronouncing any ſentence, & to looſe the bridle vnto al malefactors? Who may commit what outrage they wil, becauſe there is no tribunal vvhich can iuſtly condemne them, and no ſentence can be pronounced againſt them, vvhich they may not auoid by Luthers and Caluins doctrin.

The fiſt.

See the next booke, chap. 6 Luth. l. de ſeruo arb. Calu. l. 1. Inſt. c. 8. l. 2. c. 2.

The ſixt.

In the fift booke chap. 1.

Caluin condëneth Iudges & Tribunals.

The third Chapter ſhevveth hovv the former doctrin bringeth al Princes lavvs in contempt.

A kingdom is a ciuil body. Vvhoſe life is the Lavv.

A Kingdom is commonly called a body, not natural but ciuil and political, vvhoſe head is the King, vvhoſe eyes are the Kinges counſaylers, vvhoſe body and members are the People, and vvhoſe ſoule is the Law. For as the natural body of man, ſo ſoone as the ſoule hath left it, looſeth al vital operation, becometh gaſt, vgly, and deformed, deuoid of colour and beautie, and ſubiect to diſſolu-

to dissolution of al the members by putrifaction: So the body of a Kingdome destitute of law hath no reasonable action or motion, because it wanteth the rule of the law, vvhich squareth out al such operations, it looseth al beautie, because it wanteth law to set downe an vniforme order, vvhich is the beautie of al common welthes, and it tendeth to a dissolution of al the partes and members, because it is destitute of lawe, which is the soule and sinew that vniteth and knitteth these diuerse partes together. Wherfore Plato sayd that if men were lawles & destitute of lawes, they would litle differ from brute beastes; and the reason is because, as I haue sayd, without lawes there would be no reasonable operations, nor order amongst men, by vvhich especially a societie of men differeth from a heard of beastes. *l. 9. de leg.*

2. And because the old and ancient sages knew wel how much it imported to haue lawes in a common welth, they deuised meanes to moue the people to a great and high conceite of lawes, that they might the more vvillingly embrace them, and more diligently put them in execution. Zoroastes vvho prescribed lawes to the Bactrianes and Persians, made Oromasis the authour of them. Trismegistus who gaue lawes to the Ægiptians, sayd that a God enacted them: Minos, of vvhom the people of Crete receiued their lawes, told them that Iupiter was the inuentor of them. Charondas, to bring the Carthaginians to a reuerent conceit of his lawes, anouched that he was taught them by Saturnus: Licurgus who ruled the Lacedemonians fathered his lawes vvherewith he ruled them vpon Apollo: Solon who deuised lawes for the Athenians, affirmed that they proceded from Mineruas brayne: Plato who set downe lawes for the Sicilians and Magnesians protested, that Iupiter and Appollo had inspired him. Moyses; vvho promulgated the law vnto the Iewes told them (vvhich was true in dede) that God vvas the author thereof, and shewed them a table, wherin the tenne commandments were written. And Christ Iesus the author of the new Law professed, that he was sent by his Father, and that *the lavv and doctrin, vvhich he preached, vvas not his, but his fathers, vvho sent him.*

Lavv giuers fatbred their lavves on God.

Christ the authour of the nevv lavv.

3. And truly good reason had they to imprint in their subiectes myndes a reuerent conceite of lawes, because nothing is more soueraine, nothing more necessarie in common welths then law. Lawes are certaine conclusions of the æternal law of God and nature, they are like sinevves, vvhich bynd and knit the subiectes together, they are the life & soule of a ciuil body, they are rules and squares of humaine

Commendation of lavves.

 actions,

3. And if this wil not serue to frie him from the sentence (as I see no reason why it should not serue) then he may defend him selfe by other opinions of the new reformers. He may say, that by Luthers and Caluins opinions, which are the Patriarches of the reformed Church, he is raught that he hath no frie wil, nor choise in any action, vvhich he doth, vvhether it be good or bad, and that therfore the Iudge is vnreasonable, cruel, and barbarous, in condemning him for theft, murder, or adultrie, vvhich was not in his power to auoyd. And as iustly might he condemne him for not flying at the Kinges commandment, as for not absteining from murder, vvhen either by anger or desire of money he was moued therunto. He might alleage also for his defence, that God moued him vnto those offences, vvhich he committed and so forcibly also, that he could not resist him, for this is Caluins opinion, as before is declared: yea he might say and haue Caluin also for his authour, that God was the author and principal agent of the theft or murder, for vvhich he is condemned, and that therfore by good consequence he can not iustly be condemned for that, in vvhich God hath more part then he hath, and to vvhich he moued him so forcibly that he could not resist. What is this then (gentle reader) but to condemne al Iudges and tribunal seates, to stoppe the Iudges mouth from pronouncing any sentence, & to loose the bridle vnto al malefactors? Who may commit what outrage they wil, because there is no tribunal vvhich can iustly condemne them, and no sentence can be pronounced against them, vvhich they may not auoid by Luthers and Caluins doctrin.

The fist.

See the next booke, chap. 6 Luth. l. de seruo arb. Calu. l. 1. Inst. c. 8. l. 2. c. 2.

The sixt.

In the fift booke chap. 1.

Caluin condëneth Iudges & Tribunals.

The third Chapter shevveth hovv the former doctrin bringeth al Princes lavvs in contempt.

A Kingdom is commonly called a body, not natural but ciuil and political, vvhose head is the King, vvhose eyes are the Kinges counsaylers, vvhose body and members are the People, and vvhose soule is the Law. For as the natural body of man, so soone as the soule hath left it, looseth al vital operation, becometh gast, vgly, and deformed, deuoid of colour and beautie, and subiect to dissolu-

A kingdom is a ciuil body. Vvhose life is the Lavv.

to dissolution of al the members by putrifaction: So the body of a Kingdome destitute of law hath no reasonable action or motion, because it wanteth the rule of the law, vvhich squareth out al such operations, it looseth al beautie, because it wanteth law to set downe an vniforme order, vvhich is the beautie of al common welthes, and it tendeth to a dissolution of al the partes and members, because it is destitute of lawe, which is the soule and sinew that vniteth and knitteth these diuerse partes together. Wherfore Plato sayd that if men were lawles & destitute of lawes, they would litle differ from brute beastes; and the reason is because, as I haue sayd, without lawes there would be no reasonable operations, nor order amongst men, by vvhich especially a societie of men differeth from a heard of beastes. *l. 9. de leg.*

2. And because the old and ancient sages knew wel how much it imported to haue lawes in a common welth, they deuised meanes to moue the people to a great and high conceite of lawes, that they might the more vvillingly embrace them, and more diligently put them in execution. Zoroastes vvho prescribed lawes to the Bactrianes and Persians, made Oromasis the authour of them. Trismegistus who gaue lawes to the Ægiptians, sayd that a God enacted them: Minos, of vvhom the people of Crete receiued their lawes, told them that Iupiter was the inuentor of them. Charondas, to bring the Carthaginians to a reuerent conceit of his lawes, anouched that he was taught them by Saturnus: Licurgus who ruled the Lacedemonians fathered his lawes vvherewith he ruled them vpon Apollo: Solon who deuised lawes for the Athenians, affirmed that they proceded from Mineruas brayne: Plato who set downe lawes for the Sicilians and Magnesians protested, that Iupiter and Appollo had inspired him. Moyses; vvho promulgated the law vnto the Iewes told them (vvhich was true in dede) that God vvas the author thereof, and shewed them a table, wherin the tenne commandments were written. And Christ Iesus the author of the new Law professed, that he was sent by his Father, and that *the lavv and doctrin, vvhich he preached, vvas not his, but his fathers, vvho sent him.*

Lavv giuers fathred their lavves on God.

Christ the author of the nevv lavv.

3. And truly good reason had they to imprint in their subiectes myndes a renerent conceite of lawes, because nothing is more soueraine, nothing more necessarie in common welths then law. Lawes are certaine conclusions of the æternal law of God and nature, they are like sinevves, vvhich bynd and knit the subiectes together, they are the life & soule of a ciuil body, they are rules and squares of humaine

Commendation of lavves.

actions, they are bridles and curbes of humaine appetites, they are ſilent Magiſtrates. vvhich looke to good orders, they teach the ſubiectes their dutie, kepe them in awand otder, mainte in peace, vphold iuſtice, reuenge iniuries, defend the innocent, chaſtice the offenders, preſerue good ſubiectes from receiuing euil, and hunder the bad from offering euil; vvithout vvhich no diſcipline can be kept, no good order obſerued, no peace eſtabliſhed, no iuſtice mainteined.

Heretikes ſay the lavves bynd not.

4 Now let vs ſee vvhat eſteme the reformers make of lawes, and vvhat good counſaile their doctrin affordeth vs, to excite and ſtirre vs vp to the obſeruation of lawes. Caluin pronounceth thus: *the lavves of men vvhether they be made by the Magiſtrate, or by the Church, although they be neceſſary to be kept, yet therfore do they not by themſelues bynd in conſcience.* And for an example he affirmeth, *that the Apoſtles neither did, nor could make any lavv in their firſt Councel, but only promulgated the libertie that Chriſt had giuen: and added, not as a lavv that byndeth, but as an admonition, that of charitie to their vveake brethren, they ſhould abſtayne from thinges offered to Idols, from ſtrangled and from bloud.* And he repeateth, *that although it be neceſſary for gouernment to haue lavves humain and Eccleſiaſtical in the Church, yet they muſt not be though to bynd vs in conſcience.* So that Caluin is of opinion that although the lawes of the Church and of Princes, & magiſtrates ought to be kept, for order ſake, or for feare of offence and ſcandal, yet they bind vs not in conſcience. And he giueth his reaſon: *becauſe* (ſayth he) *if vve once grant, that men can bynd our conſciences by their vvil and lavv, Chriſt loſeth the thankes for his ſo great liberalitie,* (to wit in redeming vs from the bondage of the law) *and our conſciences loſe their profit.* The ſame is Luthers opinion, as is related before in the firſt Chapter of this booke.

Inſt. l. 4. c. 10. 27. Act. 15. par. 27. l. 5. c. 19 ſect. 14.

Chap 1.

5. And therfore I wil not ſtand now to refute this paradox, partly becauſe I haue proued already that we are bond in conſcience to obey al lawful ſuperiors, and conſequently that their lawes do bynd our conſciences: partly becauſe the abſurde ſequele of this doctrin, vvhich by and by ſhal appeare, ſufficiently confuteth it: neither wil I repeate vvhich I haue already declared, that obligation of lawes is nothing repugnant to Chriſtian libertie, becauſe we are not therfore ſayd to be fried from the yoke of the law, becauſe the law bindeth vs not, but becauſe we are fried from the old law, and haue receiued grace from Chriſt, to fulfil the new law, ſo that it can no more tyranize ouer vs, in commanding more then we are able to performe. I wil therfore draw towards my concluſion, vvhich is that the alleaged doctrin of

In the 3. booke chap. 2. Hovv vve are fried from the lavv.

Caluin

Caluin bringeth al lawes in contempt, and looseth the bridle to al malefactors.

6. And first of al I must tel Ihon Caluin that in denying lavves to bynd in conscience he taketh away al lawes, because it is the essence of a lavv to be able to bynd the subiect, and in this only it differeth from counsaile, exhortation, and admonition. Secondly Caluin by this doctrin abrogateth al promises, and contractes, euen of matrimonie, which are particular lawes. And therfore, if to say that lawes bynd in conscience, be to despoile Christ of the honour of a Redemer, and man of Christian libertie, then is it also iniurious to Christ and mans libertie, to be bond in conscience to kepe promises, and to obserue contractes, euen with wiues. Thirdly the commandements also of parentes, and maisters are particular lawes, and consequently we are not bond in conseience to obey our maisters, or parentes, and so one of the tenne commandements must be blotted out, because if we be not bond to obey our parentes, which is one of the chiefest honours we can giue them, we are not bond to honour out parentes. Yea by this doctrin it folovveth that the tenne commandementes bynd vs not in conscience: which though our aduersaries wil not stick to grant, as we shal see in the next booke, yet vvho seeth not vvith vvhat absurditie? *The first illation.* *The second.* *The third.* *The fourth.* *See the fifte booke chap. 3. and the 7.*

7. Lastly, at the least, which yet is not the least absurditie, this doctrin bringeth al lawes in contempt. For as the wild and vnbroken colt litle careth, if you should tye him with heares or threedes, because he knoweth that such bandes are not of force to hold him: so when men are once perswaded that lawes of Princes bynd them not in conseience, they wil make litle scruple to transgres them, and so lawes are brought into contempt. And although feare of the penaltie or punishement, which the law layth on them, may make them sometymes to kepe them, for feare of punishement, yet when they can escape the ministers of iustice eyes, or handes, or auoid by subtile shift, or open force, the payne of the law, they wil make no scruple of transgressing the law. For why should they make conscience of that which toucheth not conscience? *a similitude.*

8. But Caluin wil say, that they ought notwithstanding to kepe lawes for order sake, and for auoiding of offence. But then I aske Caluin what he meaneth, when he sayth that they ought to kepe the law? either he meaneth by those wordes an obligation in conscience, vnder payne of sinne, and then it foloweth (which Caluin wil not grant)

grant) that lawes bynd in conſcience: or elſe he meaneth only a congruitie or decencie, and then it foloweth ſtil that lavves are brought in contempt. For if once a man be perſwaded, that it is only conuenient but not neceſſarie to kepe the law, he nedeth to make no ſcruple to tranſgres the lavv, becauſe the tranſgreſſion is no ſinne, but only an incongruitie.

Caluin giueth libertie to al Rebelles.

9. And ſo if this doctrin be true, men wil not care a ſtraw for the Princes lavves. Rebellious ſubiectes, mutinous ſouldiars, ſtubborne children, crooked ſeruantes, may be diſobedient by Caluin becauſe no law, nor commandement can bynd them in conſcience to loyal obedience. And then lawes loſe their force, authoritie is not to be eſteemed, rebellion and mutinie are allowed, the way is open to al malefactors, al outrages are lawful, becauſe where no law bindeth, no ſinne can be committed, no man is ſubiect, euery man is lavvles, and as frie as the king, ſubiect to no lavv nor authoritie of God or man. VVhat ſecuritie hath a Prince amongſt ſuch lavvles ſubiects? How can he chooſe but feare reuolt and rebellion of thoſe, vvho are perſvvaded by religion, that no lavv can bynd them in conſcience, to order and obedience? Is this religion like to be of God, vvhich is ſo oppoſit to humaine authoritie, vvhich is of God: yea vvhich alſo deſpoileth God of al authoritie to command his creatures? If our noble Prince and graue Counſellers in England conſidered wel this doctrin, then certes the firſt Parlament they called, ſhould be to baniſh this lavvles and licentious Religion, which bringeth lawes in contempt, Princes in danger, and openeth the gap to outrages of malefactors.

litle ſecuritie for a prince giuen by this doctrin.

Rom. 13.

***

The

The fourth Chapter shevveth hovv according to their doctrin, no Prince can rely on his subiects, no subiects on their Prince, nor on felovv subiects, and consequenly al Societie, and ciuil conuersation is taken avvay.

MAN, as I haue vpon an other occasion declared, is of nature bent and inclined to company and conuersation in some Societie or other: vvhere if he be a Superior he ruleth, if he be an inferior he is ruled, and learneth to comply with his felowe subiects. And of these three parts consisteth ciuil conuersation. For if the Prince rule not as he should do, or the inferior obey not his superior, or comply not with his felow subiect as he ought to do, gouernment degenerateth into tyranne, obedience turneth to rebellion, and conuersation to ciuil dissension. *Man ciuile.* *3. partes of ciuil societie.*

2. These three partes are mainteined by one thing, vvhich is trust or confidence of one in an other. For seing that the Prince can not do al alone, but must expect aide & assistance of his subiects, he shal neuer rule wel vnles he may rely vpon the fidelitie and correspondence of his subiects. And if the subiect put not a confidence in his Superior, as in one that tendreth the common good of al, and particular of euery one, he wil neuer obey willingly, nor rely on him securely, but shal euer liue in feare and distrust of him. And if one subiect trust not an other, euerie one shal liue in suspicion of an other, and so mens words wilbe taken but for wind, promises contractes and bargaines wil not hold assuredly, frendship breaketh, familiaritie decaieth, and conuersation is ruined. For who wil make bargaines, or strike a league of frendship, or familiaritie with them, on whose secrecie, fidelitie, and other correspondence he hath not any probable assurance, because he putteth no trust nor confidence in them: rather hath he cause to fly al company, and like a *Misanthropos* an hater of men, to liue in woods and wildetnes, then in townes cities and societies. Now, if the reformers doctrin (which teacheth that lawes bynd not in conscience) may goe for currant, the three partes of ciuil conuersation are taken away, *Vvhich are maintained by Confidece.* *Calu. l. 4. Inst. c. 10.* *Luth. in c. 2. Gal.*

away, and so Societies must breake vp, and euerie one must liue alone, like an Anachorite or Heremite, because in company is no securitie, vvhere according to this doctrin, neither the Prince can rely, on his subiects, nor they on him, nor one subiect on an other.

See the first booke 3. chap.

3. And to begin with the Prince, vvhat confidence can he put in his subiects, who are persvvaded in religion, that neither his lawes can bynd them to obedience, nor the law of God or nature hinder them from rebellion, mutinie, or other outrages? hath he not iust cause thus to discourse with him selfe? This people is persvvaded by religion, that no law bindeth them in conscience, and consequently they make no scruple, nor conscience of Rebellion, for vvhere no law bindeth in conscience, there no conscience is to be made: I must therfore stand continually on my gard, and rely vpon no subiects fidelitie. And how shal I stand on my garde, vvhen euen my garde according to Caluins opinion, is bond by no law, to be true and faithful vnto me. And so he shal liue alwayes in feare of his subiects.

The prince can not rely on Caluinist fidelitie.

4. And on the otherside, vvhat confidence can the subiects haue in their Prince? For if no law bynd him in conscience, he hauing al in his owne hands, may vse vvhat extorsion and tyrannie he pleaseth. For vvhat should withhold him from it? feare of god? God can not iustly punish vvhere no lawes bynd in conscience, and so he is not to be feared. Conscience? Where no lawe byndeth, conscience nedeth to make no scruple. Vvhy then is not al lawful for the Prince vvhich he liketh? And so the subiect shal euer haue his Superior in suspicion.

Subiects by Caluins doctrin must not trust their princes.

5. And vvhat good felow ship, amitie, or conuersation can there be amongst the subiectes, vvho must nedes, by this doctrin liue in a continual feare and distrust one of an other, because no man is bond to kepe touch and correspondence vvith an other. For if lawes bynd not, promises and contractes, not only in lending and borowing, buying and selling, but also in marying, are not of force to bynd our consciences, because they are but particular lawes. or if they are more forcible in bynding then lawes, then according to Caluin, Christ is no perfect Redemer, because he hath not fried vs from the bondage of promises, & bargaines, which notwithstanding are no lawes of Princes, but particular lawes of particular men, made betwixt man and man, for more assured conuersation. And so the wife may iustly feare lest her husband when he is weary of her, or liketh better of an other, may shake her of, and diuorse him selfe from her. For why may he not? If lawes of Princes bynd not in conscience, then the contract of

Nor one an-other.

Nor the vvife her husband.

matrimo-

matrimonie (which according to Caluin is but a particular law & no Sacrament) can take no hold on conſciẽce, & ſo by the libertie vvhich Caluin giueth him, to be frie in cõſcience from al lawes, he may leaue his wife, as often as he wil, and as often take an other. And if his wife complaine that he kepeth not promiſe with her: he may anſwer her eaſily, that if he be not bond in conſcience to keepe Gods lawe, he is not bond to kepe the law of matrimonie, vvhich is but a particular law. And if ſhe reply that God alſo commandeth vs to kepe this particular law and contract, he may tel her that he confeſſeth it to be true, but Caluin hath aſſured him that Chriſt hath fried him in conſcience, from al obligation of al lawes, whether they be humaine or diuine: and ſo he is not bond to kepe the law of matrimonie: and therfore chalenging his libertie, he may leaue his wife as lawfully and as friely, as if he had neuer made her promiſe, becauſe no law, much leſſe anye promiſe, is able to bynd in conſcience.

6. In like maner let merchantes who vſe to lend money, or to ſel of truſt and credit, looke better about them, then hitherto they haue doone. For if no lawes bind in conſcience, then contractes alſo bynd not, & ſo their debtẽrs may chalenge the libertie, which Caluin hath giuen them, vvhich is not to be bond in conſcience to pay them a peny. We muſt henceforth alſo take hede not only of knowen theeues and murderers, but of them alſo that go for honeſt men, yea euen of our neereſt and deareſt freinds: for vvhat ſhould withhold them, from doing vs a miſchiefe, if no law neither of God, nor man, nor nature, bynd them in conſcience? And ſo the parentes may diſtruſt their children, and the children their parentes, becauſe according to Caluins opinion, the one is not bond to the other, neither by the law of God nor nature. The huſband muſt liue alwayes in iealouſie of his vvife, and ſhe of him, becauſe the lavv of matrimonie according to this opinion, bindeth not one partie in conſcience, to kepe touch vvith the other.

Merchants by Caluins opinion muſt truſt no debters.

Nor the parẽts their children.

Nor the huſband his vvife.

7. And ſo by this doctrin no man in any thing can truſt or rely on an other, but al muſt liue in feare, iealouſie, and ſuſpicion of others: and ſo they muſt forſake ſocieties and flye to mountaines, and truſt rather to beaſts, vvhom nature vvithholdeth from iniuries, then vnto men, vvhom, according to Caluins doctrin, no lavv, & conſequently no conſcience ſtayeth, or vvitholdeth from miſchief. By this let the reader take a ſcantling of this doctrin, & iudge vvhether it be like to be of God, that is ſo oppoſit to al ſocietie, vvhich is of God.

Societie ruined by Caluin.

THE

THE SEVENTH BOOKE CONTAINETH A SVRVEY OF THE NEVV DOCTRIN CONCERNING MANERS, IN which is declared, hovv by diuers of their opinions they open the gappe vnto al vice.

The first Chapter shevveth hovv the reformers take avvay hope of heauen and feare of hel, and consequently open the gap to al vice.

TVVo thinges there are which as firme and constant pillers do vphold and sustaine al common welthes from falling, and præserue wel ordered societies from dissoluing: to wit, hope of reward, and feare of punishment. Hope like a spurre pricketh and eggeth onvvard vnto vertue, feare pulleth backe from vice: hope inciteth vs to obserue the law, feare maketh vs not to transgresse the law. VVherfore Solon the graue lawgiuer, vvas vvont to say, that payne and revvard are the things, which kepe al Societies in avv and order. And wel in dede might he say so, for take away hope of reward, & men wilbe slouthful and sluggish in the exercise of vertue, and laudable actions: and take away feare of punishment, and the euil disposed vvil be as forward in attempting of theftes, murders, treasons, treacheries, and whatsoeuer villanies.

Hope and feare are stayes of common Welthes.

Solnos saying.

Hope and feare necessary in the church.

2. These tvvo things so necessarie in a common welth, Christ would not haue to be wanting in his Church, which is the best ordered

ordered common wealth that euer was on earth, and therfore he proposeth vnto vs a heauen to hope for, & an hel to feare; the one to stirre vs vp to al vertuous actions, the other to deterre vs from al wicked attempts. For although vertue (as the Philosopher sayth) be so amiable & so beseeming mans reasonable nature, that if there were no heauen nor no other reward of vertue, but vertue, yet we should imbrace it for it selfe, & liue chastly for the loue of chastitie, iustly for the loue of iustice, and temperatly for the loue of temperance: and although vice be a thing so detestable, filthie, abominable, and repugnant to the reasonable part of man, that if there were no hel nor punishment for it, yet we should detest it for it selfe, & flye it for the dishonestie vvhich it implyeth: yet on the one side, because vertue is repugnant to sensualitie, & placed amid many difficulties, like a rose amongst thornes, man would neuer long liue vertuously, if there were no other reward for vertuous actions, then vertues honestie: and on the other side, vice is so pleasing to sensualitie, and so sutable to our corrupt nature, that if there were no other punishment to deterre men from it, then the dishonestie, vvhich is ioyned with it, few or none vvould flye and eschew it. Wherfore God hath proposed a heauen to allure vs to vertue, and a hel to deterre vs from vice: *Come* (sayth Christ to the good, vvhose reward is heauen) *yee blessed of my Father, enioye the Kingdom prepared for you, from the beginning of the vvorld.* And in terrible words he thundreth out the sentence against the reprobate, vvhose punishement is the fier of hel: *Depart from me yee accursed into euerlasting fier, vvhich is prepared for the deuil and his angels.*

Heauen and Hel.

The reason.

7h 1.2. q. 10 art. 2.

Vertue is a rose amidst thornes.

Mat. 25.

Heauen alureth.

Ibidem.

Hel terrifieth.

3. And that this heauen, and the hope of it, may the more forcibly moue to good life, and obseruation of the commandmentes, the holy Scripture setteth it forth with al the glorious titles in the vvorld, and euen with the names of those things vvhich men most desire: If you desire life, heauen is called *eternal life*. If you couet rest, heauen is a repose after labour. If light be grateful, heauen is a perpetual light shining in the faces of the Saincts. If mariage like you, heauen is a perpetual mariage. If pleasure please you, heauen is a riuer of pleasure. If banquetting be thy desire, heauen is a supper & a great supper, where with Angels we shal by fruition and cleare vision, satiate our selues in feeding vpon the Diuinitie: If home be grateful vnto the, heauen is thy countrie, from vvhence according to thy soule thou fetchest thy race and origin, and whither thou traueleſt so long as in this vvorld thou liueſt, vvhich is but a way or Inne, no home nor mansion place.

Heauēs titles.

Io. 6. & 10.

Apoc. 4.

Sap. 18.

Apoc. 22.

Luc. 12.

Psal. 15.

Luc. 14.

Psal. 130.

If a Paradise, vvhose name importeth a place of al honest pleasure and felicitie, delighteth, heauen is called so, and vvas by Christ him selfe promised to the good theefe by no other name. Briefly if thou desire a reward of al thy paines and trauels, heauen is the common wage of al Gods seruants, a gole to runne at, and a crowne to fight for.

Luc. 23.
Mat. 20.
1. Cor. 9.

Hels names.

Vide Bel. to. 1. l. 4 de Christo. c. 10. & Authorem Resol. Angl. l. 1. p. 1.

Mal. c. 4.

Apoc. 14. 19.

Mat. 22.

4. In like maner to make vs to refrain from sinne for feare of hel, holy Scripture giueth hel very terrible names, and painteth it forth in terrible formes. It is called in Greeke and Latin by names vvhich signifie a lowe and deepe place vnder the ground, in Hebrew by a name vvhich signifieth a great goulfe. The Prophet Malachie calleth it a fornace, for the kindling of vvhich the vvicked must be the straw and fewel. S. Ihon calleth it the lake of Gods ire, because the anger of God is as it were al gathered to that place, and there especially is manifested in those exceeding torments, yea he termeth it also a standing poole, repleni shed with fier & brimston. Christ him selfe giueth it the name of *vtter darkenes, vvhere shal be vveeping and gnashing of teeth.* Iob sayth that in that place *is no order, but sempiternal horror.* And vvhy doth Scripture so liuely set forth these two things, heauen and hel, but because God the author of Scripture, vvould haue vs hope for the one, and feare the other, knowing that nothing beareth greater sway in the rule and good discipline of a common welth, then hope of reward, and feare of punishment.

The force of hope.

Aug. l. 4. de ciuit. c. 20.

5. For if the hope of temporal honors, fame, and riches giueth such courage to the harts of men, that they wil runne through fier and water for the attaining of the same; how shal the hope of heauen and the immortal crownes, vvhich there are layed vp for vs in store, incite vs and egge vs forward vnto al laudable actions? If Mutius could haue the courage to hold his hand in the fier for hope of tẽporal renowme and glorie for such fortitude: vvhat fiers and waters, heat and cold, shal not a Christian, armed with hope of heauen, be able to endure courgiously? Shal the souldiar runne through the pikes & passe by the cannon mouth, for hope of a spoile or victorie, & shal not Christians deuoure al difficulties for hope of heauen? And looke how much hope eggeth forward to laudable actions, so much and no lesse doth feare restraine vs from euil, and is no lesse necessarie to bridle the licentious, then hope to animate the vertuous. Wherefore the ancient so esteemed feare, that the citie of Spartha made it a God, and dedicated a Temple vnto it, as to the preseruer of their common welth.

The force of feare.

6. But because there are diuers kindes of feare, it shal be necessarie to distin-

to distinguish them, that we may see which is that feare, which is so commendable. First therfore there is a wordly and humain feare, which is conceiued for some temporal euil, or humaine respect, and this sometymes is good, and sometymes also bad. As for example, if for feare of the princes displeasure, or torment, or death which he threateneth, we offend God in transgressing his law, or doing against our conscience, this feare is euil, and no lesse euil then the sinne of which it is the cause. This feare made S. Peter to deny his Maister: which also our Sauiour forbiddeth saying: *feare not them who kil the body*, that is, offend not God for feare of them, that can only kil the body, but rather feare God who can cast both body and soule in to the fier of hel. But if for feare of the magistrate we abstaine from sinne, this feare is not euil, and therfore S. Paul biddeth vs feare the magistrate, because (sayth he) *not without cause he caryeth the sword, for he is the minister of God*. The second feare is called a reuerential feare, which proceedeth from a high conceite of the Diuine Maiestie, and remaineth (as Dauid sayth) and that for euer also, euen in the blessed. For although they be assured that they shal neuer suffer any euil, and therfore feare no euil at Gods hands: yet when they behold the soueraigne Maiestie of God, who punisheth the damned, & could annihilate the blessed if he would, they conceiue a great reuerence, which is called reuerential feare, much like as children who are assured that their father will not touch them, yet conceiue a reuerential feare at the very sight of him, especially if they see him sharpe and seuere with his seruants. The third feare is called filial or childrens feare, which maketh vs afrayed to sinne, not for feare of punishment, but for feare of offending; and this feare they haue who though they were sure neuer to suffer punishment, neither in this life nor the next, yet would not commit a sinne because it is an offence of God. Which feare is called filial, because good children are afrayed to do any thing, which shal offend their parentes, though they were sure they should not be punished. Of which feare S. Austin discoursing sayth, that otherwise doth the adultresse feare her husband, otherwise the chaste spouse: she feareth lest he come and punish, but the other feareth lest he be offended and forsake her. The fourth is called seruile feare, which maketh vs to abstaine from sinne, for feare of hel and damnation: which is called seruile, because it is proper to seruants to do their dutie for feare of punishment. And this feare in expresse termes the reformers condemne as I shal relate; the other feares their doctrin

Humain feare.

Mat.26.c.10.

Rom.13.

Th.2.2.q.19.

Psal.18.

Reuerential feare.

Filial feare.

In Psal.118.

Seruile feare.

disalo weth. But lest I may seeme to charge them with more then they say, I wil make them speake, in their owne wordes, their opinion of hope and feare.

7. And first of Hope Caluin sayth plainly, that God is not delighted with that obedience, which the hope of reward in heauen beateth out of vs: *for God* sayth he, *loueth a chearful giuer, and forbiddeth any thing to be giuen as it were of heauines or necessitie.* So that according to Caluin, it is sinne to giue almes or to fulfil the commandements for hope of reward in heauen. But Caluins reason is as bad as his doctrin. For he proueth it to be vnlawful to be obedient to God, for hope of reward, because that is to giue God his dew with heauines: and yet we see that hope is so farre from making vs to do thinges heauily, and with an euil wil, that it encourageth vs, and pricketh vs forward with a willing mynd, as is already proued, and experience may witnes.

l. 3. Inst. c. 15. par. 1.

in Antid. Sess 6. Can. 31.

Caluin condēneth hope of heauen.

8. And as for feare of hel, Luther condemneth it euen vnto hel, saying that it maketh a man an hypocrite and a greater sinner. And as concerning the other kindes of feare, their doctrin in a maner abolisheth them al. They affirme as is before mentioned, that no lawes bynd in conscience: whence folow these conclusions. First that neither Princes nor Iudges haue authoritie to condemne vs to any paine, as is before proued, because where no law byndeth, no Prince can iustly punish the transgression, and so humaine feare is taken away. Secondly this doctrin abolisheth al filial feare: for where no law byndeth in conscience, no sinne can be committed, and so we need not to feare theftes and murders, for feare of offending God, because where no sinne is, no offence is to be feared. Reuerential feare also they abandone, because as is before proued, in denying lawes to bynd they take away al authoritie euen from God, and where no authoritie is, no reuerence is dew.

a. 6. apud Roff & Ser 3 pœn. *Luther condēneth feare of Hel.*

They take away feare of lawes and magistrates.

They take away filial feare.

Yea reuerētial feare also.

9. As for seruile feare, they condemne it in expresse termes. And Luthers wordes we haue heard already: let vs heare also Caluin speake. He affirmeth that a sinner can not be iust, vnles he beleue assuredly that he is elect, predestinate and vndoubtedly to be saued: whence folowveth that no man must feare hel, yea that no man can feare hel, and retaine his fayth. For if he be by fayth sure of saluation, he can not feare hel and damnation, because he is as assured of escaping hel, as of attaning heauen, & no man can feare that euil which he is assured to escape. As for exāple, no man feareth lest the heauens fal vpon

l. 3. Inst. c. 26. par. 6. 7. 8.

Seruile feare also.

Feare of Hel standeth not with Caluins faith.

him

him. Or if Caluin feare hel, he looseth his faith, because he is not assured to escape hel, and to attaine to heauen. And because Caluin saw wel ynough that feare of hel is taken away by this his doctrin; he checketh S. Gregorie the great, saying that *he teacheth pestilently* when he sayth in a certain homelie: that *we know only our calling, but are vncertain of our election*: wherby (sayth Caluin) he moueth al men to feare and trembling, because we know what we be to day, but what we shal be, we know not. Luther also as he holdeth the same opinion of assurednes of saluation, so he biddeth vs to take hede lest we feare hel or iudgement, because that were to loose our fayth. These are his words: *Wherfore if thou be a sinner as verily we al are, do not propose vnto thy selfe Christ as a iudge in a rayn-bowe, for then thou wilt be afrayed and despaire, but apprehend the definition of christ, that he is no exactor of the law, but a propitiation.* So that Luther thinketh that Christ wil exacte no law at the handes of a faithful man, and therfore he nedeth not to feare hel, in which transgressors of the law are punished. Wherfore as they take away al hope of reward, so they take away al feare, and especially the feare of hel, which is the greatest bridle that is, to restraine men from sinne.

Hom. 38. in Mat. euang.

Luther and Caluin will not haue men feare Hel.

in to. 2. c. 1. ad Gal.

Luthers counsel.

10. But first I wil aske them, why holie Scripture setteth forth heauen and hel with such names and titles, if it be a sinne to hope for the one, or to feare the other? Truly if it be sinne, then hath God in setting forth heauen and hel so liuely, layed baytes to catch vs, and to allure vs to sinne. And why then doth Scripture in so many places command vs to hope, and to feare? And how are those two thinges vnlawful, which are so necessarie in al common welthes? Why may the plowghman trauel al the day in hope of his wages, the husbandman sow his sede in hope of a haruest, the soldiar folow the warres in hope of honour, and yet a Christian man may not fulfil the commandementes in hope of a reward in heauen? For if it be lawful to hope for heauen, why is it not lawful also to giue almes in hope of heauen, as Dauid inclined his hart to *keepe the law for reward and retribution*? They answer that we must serue God purely for his loue and glorie, but not for reward. True, that must be the principal end, but yet thence it followeth not, but that we may also serue for reward, as for a secondarie end and motiue. But say they, he that serueth for reward, would not serue God if reward were not, which argueth an euil mynd. I answer that al men are not so affected. And if hope of heauen be of that force as to moue them to kepe the law, why may it not also be suffi-

Hope & feare

Psal. 118. 2. fond answers reiected

be sufficient to moue them to lay aside that euil affection, vvhich is also against the law? In like manner if I may lawfully feare death and other euils of the body, why may I not feare hel, vvhich is the greatest punishement that is both of soule and body? and if I may feare hel, why may I not absteine from sinne or fulfil the law, for feare of hel? They say, the reason is, because he that fulfilleth the law for feare of hel, vvould sinne with al his hart, if hel were not. Be it so: yet this argueth feare to be good rather then euil, because it is a cause why we absteine at least from the outward act of sinne: and if the mynd be euil disposed, that procedeth not from the feare of hel, but from an euil disposition. Yea if feare of hel be sufficient to kepe vs frō the act of sinne, it is sufficient also to restraine vs from the euil desire of the mynd, because against that also hel is prepared.

A difference betvvixt feare of hel & feare of other paines

11. And in this is a plaine difference betwixt feare of hel and temporal punishments: because Princes by temporal paines punish only the outward act, of which only they can iudge; and therfore the theefe may absteine from theft for feare of hanging, and yet haue an inward desire to steale: but God punisheth in hel not only outward act, but also the inward affection and desire of sinne: and therfore, if feare of hel kepe a man from theft, it wil restraine him also from the desire. And consequently feare of hel can not be il, but rather good, vvhich is no cause of il, but rather a cause why we absteine from euil. And although some peraduenture, yea and without peraduenture, vvould sinne and neglect the commandements, if hope of heauen and feare of hel were not, yet that is no argument that therin they sinne, if they haue no present il affection or consent to sinne. For so many vvould sinne if they should liue longer, or if they had this or that ocasion, or if God gaue them not this and that grace, and yet, that they vvould sinne, is no sinne, if they haue no present affection or desire to sinne. Yea this is an argument that hope of heauen and feare of hel are very laudable and good, because they are bridles to restraine men from sinning. Wherfore to draw nere a conclusion, vvhich is, that our Reformers in taking away hope of heauen and feare of hel, open the dore to al vice: I report me to the indifferent reader, how the Church is like to flourish in vertue without hope of heauen, and feare of hel, seing that as is proued, no commonwelth can enioy temporal and ciuil peace and discipline without them.

12 Take away hope of heauen, & take away prayer, almes deeds, erecting of Churches, founding of Colleges and hospitals: then fasting and

sting and penance, vvorkes of iustice, mercy and charitie, wil decay: in briefe men wil be negligent, and slouthful in exercise of vertue and obseruation of the law. For vvho wil runne that seeth no gole? vvho vvil fight that hopeth for no victorie? who wil vvorke that looketh for no rewarde. I know that the very loue of God, yea of vertue should moue vs to good, but yet so dul we are, and so backward, that these motiues litle moue vs, and so natural vnto vs it is, to be moued with hope of reward, that if men hoped not for heauen, few vvould striue to ouercome their passions, and the difficultie in exercise of vertue, and obseruation of the commandements.

vvhat foloveth vvhen hope is taken avvay.

13. Likewise if feare be the keper, preseruer, and conseruer of al cómon welthes, how shal we imagin that the Church of God can stand vvithout it? I grant that sinne is so fowle a thing, that euen for the hatred of sinne, we should abandone sinne, but seing that sinne is so agreable to our corrupt nature, & neuer appeareth in her owne likenes, but is alwayes masked and disguised with a shew of commoditie, pleasure, or profit; few there are who vvould absteine from sinne for the turpitude therof and dishonestie vvhich it implyeth. For vvhat should restraine a man from sinne? shame of the vvorld? I suppose he hath a secret place. Feare of temporal punishment? I supose the fault be vnknowen? Feare of God? VVho wil feare God that feareth not hel, vvhich he hath prepared? VVherfore if notwithstanding the hope of heauen and feare of hel (vvhich for al Caluins heresie possesseth the hartes of most men) yet so few liue vprightly and so many go awry, vvhat vvould they do, if hope of heauen, and feare of hel were quite rooted out of their myndes? Truly the narrow path of vertue vvould be ouergro vne with vveeds, for vvant of treading, and the broad way of vice vvould become so smoth, that none vvould imbrace vertue, al vvould tumble headlonge into the depth of vice, and pleasure: and so the way to vertue vvould be hedged vp, & the gate and vvay to vice would alvvayes lie open, heauen vvould be a place inaccessible, and hel our common home.

The necessitie of feare of hel

The conclusion.

The second Chapter shewveth howw in teaching that only faith iustifieth, they open the vvay to al vice.

SATAN the common enemy of mankind, knowing howw easily he might entise and allure vs to sinne (to vvhich thing his malicious mynd is alvvayes bent & inclined) if he could persvvade the vvorld, that only faith sufficeth for mans iustification; hath long since gone about to beate this doctrin into mens heades, and to bevvitch their vnderstandings vvith it. And because he knoweth that when he speaketh in his owne person and likenes, he findeth litle audience, he hath gone about, and that euen in the Apostles tyme, by certaine of his ministers, who went vnder the name of Christians, to intrude vpon vs this his pestilent doctrin. For they not vnderstanding (as S. Peter sayth) what S. Paul sayd, would make him speake as fooles make belles to sound, to wit, as they imagined: and so auouched that only faith vvas sufficient to iustification and saluation, and that S. Paul so warranted vs. Wherfore S. Austin affirmeth that S. Peter, S. Ihon, S. Iames, and S. Iude wrote their Epistles to refel and refute this heresie, and to expound S. Paules meaning. After these companions, Simon Magus imbraced the same opinion, and after him Eunomius, who bragged that the faith which they preached, vvas sufficient to saue their folovvers, vvhat sinnes soeuer they committed.

2. Pet. 1.

l. de fide & operibus.

2. This damnable heresie long since dead in the mynds of men, & buried also in hel, Luther not by miracle, but mere madnes hath called to life again: who in diuers places affirmeth that only faith iustifierh, before, and without charitie and good vvorkes. And because he saw that in thus saying, he semed to open the way to al wickednes, he addeth an other heresie, to wit, that true faith and good workes can not be seuered, and therfore (sayth he) although only faith iustifie, yet that argueth nor that good workes are not necessary, because a true faith alwayes bringeth with it good vvorkes. Caluin ioyneth vvith Luther in this opinion, affirming that faith only iustifieth, and that good workes are only signes and effectes of this faith. Yea Luther and he both,

Ar. 10. 18. l. de Christiana libertate. Com. in c. 2. Gal. The solafidiās opinion.

l 3 c. 14. par. 17. c 18 par. 8

he both, auouch, as shal be afterwards declared, that good vvorkes are so farre from iustifying, that they are al mortal sinnes, and by faith only obteyne this fauour of God, as not to be reputed nor imputed to the faithful man. And this faith (sayth Caluin) iustifieth not a vvorke of ours, because vvhatsoeuer procedeth from our corrupt nature, he counteth sinne, but as it is an instrument by which we apprehend Christs iustice, & apply it to our selues, and make it so our owne, that no sinne is imputed vnto vs. These are his words: *The power of iustifying, vvhich faith hath, consisteth not in the vvorthines of the vvorke: our iustification standeth vpon the only mercie of God, and the deseruing or merit of Christ, vvhich iustification vvhen faith taketh hold on, it is sayd to iustifie*: So that faith also according to Caluin, is a sinne, because it is a kind of vvorke of ours, yet it iustifieth, because it apprehendeth Christs iustice, and so by a sinne as by an instrument vvhich apprehendeth Christs iustice, we are made or rather repured iust.

Caluin sayth that only faith iustifieth, and yet that it is a sinne.

3. But before I come to inferre my intéded conclusion out of this doctrin, I wil be so bold as to aske them, vvhere they read in Scripture that only faith iustifieth? S. Paul (say they) affirmeth *that a man is iustified by faith*: True, but he sayth not, by only faith; neither doth any place of Scripture auouch so much. Wherfore Luther seing that this place was not plain inough to proue, that only faith iustifieth, in his Germaine translation, he foysted in (only) into the text, making S. Paul to say: *vve thinke a man to be iustified by faith only*. And being warned of this his corruption of scripture by a certain freind of his, he answered, that that vvas the meaning: vvherin yet he shewed him self a false translator, vvhose office is to translate faithfully as the words ye, and not as he vvould haue them interpreted, for that is the office of an interpretor: and if this be lawful for Luther, heretiques haue scope inough to make scriptures speake, as they vvil imagin that they should speake. But Luther wil say that S. Paul sayth that a man is iustified by sayth, and not by the vvorks of the law, which is al one as if he had sayd, that a man is iustified by faith only, and not by good vvorks. But to this I answere that if S. Paul had sayd, that a man is iust by faith and not by vvorks, adding no more, then Luther had had some argument; but he sayth not so, but only, that a man is iust by faith and not by the vvorks of the law, excluding only the Iudaical Sacramentes and ceremonies, vvhich he calleth vvorks of the lavv: and vvhen in other places he excludeth vvorks, he meaneth the selfe same vvorks, or else those vvorks

Rom. 3.

Luth. corrupteth the text, to proue that only faith iustifieth.

In Resp. ad duos art. ad amicum.

Ex Bel. to. 3 l. 2 de iust. c. 16.

Luth. answer to his freinds admonition.

His obiection answered.

What vvorks S. Paul excludeth.

Rom. 6. Gal. 2. 3.

vvhich proceed not from faith and grace, such as were the vvorkes of the Gentils.

Hovv faith iustifieth.

4. Neither is faith sayd to iustifie, because that only iustifieth, but because it is the beginning, and ground vvorke of iustification, or because it concurreth to iustification. or because by that faith which iustifieth, is vnderstood, not a naked faith but a faith ioyned with charitie & good vvorkes, such as S. Paul speaketh of, vvhen writing to the Galathians, he excludeth the workes of the law, saying that *in Christ Iesu neither Circumcision is of any vvorth, nor the Prepuce, but faith vvhich vvorketh by charitie.* Wherfore S. Paul is so farre from thinking that only fayth iustifieth, that he auoucheth that if he *had all the faith in the vvorld & so great a faith that he could moue mountaines, yet if he had not charitie, he vvere nothing.* And if Luther and Caluin, because scripture sometymes sayth, that faith iustifieth, wil therfore inferre, that faith only iustifieth: then because scripture saith that *by hope vve are saued*, & that *blessed is the man that hopeth in God*, I wil inferre that only hope iustifieth: and because scripture also affirmeth that *the man is happie that feareth our lord*, I wil conclude that feare only instifieth. Or if they wil answere that hope and feare are sayd to iustifie, and to make man happie, because they dispose or concurre to iustification and happines, the same I wil say of faith, to wit, that it is sayd to iustifie, not because it only iustifieth, but because it disposeth with charitie, it concurreth to our iustification. For

Iustification ascribed to charitie especially.

to charitie also is attributed our iustification, and more then vnto faith. For as Christ told S. Marie Magdalen, that her faith had saued her, so he sayd that *many sinnes vvere forgiuen her, because she loued much*: and Scripture attributeth those effects to charitie, vvhich are necessarilie linked with iustification. As for example, charitie is called *the fulnes of the lavv, the end of the lavv, the obseruation of the lavv*, and the *bond or knot of perfection.* Charitie also is sayd to make *vs children of God*, by it the holy *ghost is sayd to be diffused in our hartes*: charitie is sayd to *hide and couer our sinnes*, and to *make God do dvvel in our hartes.* S. Ihon pronounceth boldly that vvho *loueth his brother by charitie, is in the light*, & that we are *translated from the darkenes*, that is of sinne, to *the light*, that is of iustication, *because vve loue our brethren.* yea he sayth that *vvhosoeuer loueth not, remaineth in death.* And againe: *Euerie one that loueth, is borne of God.* By which it is plaine, that either charitie is alwayes ioyned with the grace of iustification (as S. Thomas sayth) or that it is al one with the sayd grace, as others say, and so is the formal cause of iustification, and then faith only concurreth as a disposition, as hope also and feare do. At least hence it follo-

Gal. 5.

1. Cor. 13.

Rom. 8.

Psal. 83.

Psal. 111.

Luc. 7.

Mat. 22.

Rom. 13. Col. 3

1. Tim. 1.

1. Io. 3. Rom. 4. 1. Pet. 5. 1. Io. 4.

1. Io. 2.

Ibidem.

Th. 1. 2. q. 110. a. 3. 4.

Scot. 2. d. 26.

Durand. dem.

lowe

loweth that only faith iustifieth not, because he that hath not charitie, as S. Ihon sayth, remaineth in death, and if a man haue al the faith in the vvorld (as S. Paul sayth) vvithout charitie, he is so farre from being iust, that he is nothing, and no body. *Supra.*

5. Now, vvheras they say, that faith only iustifieth, but not vvithout charitie and good vvorkes, because it can not be vvithout them, it is an other absurd heresie. For S. Paul vvhen he sayth, that if he had al the faith in the vvorld, and yet haue no charitie, he is nothing, suppoſeth that faith may be separated from charitie. And S. Iames suppoſing that it may be vvithout good vvorkes, sayth, that *faith vvithout good vvorkes is dead*, and diuers parables as of the corne, and cockle in the same barne, of good and bad fishes in the same nette, of good and bad gueſtes at the same supper, yea of the sheep and goates also, argue that men may be in the Church by faith, and yet be bad Christians for vvant of charitie and good vvorkes, vvhich the good Christians haue. Yea reason teacheth, that it is one thing to beleue and to know our dutie by faith, and an other thing to do our dutie. Yea if there were no other argument, then the euil life of Lutherans and Caluinists, who bragge that they haue true faith, and yet liue most viciously, it vvould conuince them, that faith (if there be any in them) may be seuered from good vvorkes, and ioyned with euil. *1. Cor. 13. Faith vvithout good vvorkes. Iac. 2. Caluin in praefat. recepit hunc lib. Mat. 13. Ibidem. Mat. 21. & 25*

6. But to come to a conclusion, if faith only iustifie, then it followeth that the way is opened vnto al vice and villanie. For vvhen they come to the definition of this faith which only iustifieth, they say that it is an assurance by vvhich we are fully perſvvaded that Christs iustice is ours, by vvhich faith also they say, Christs iustice is so applyed vnto vs, that it is ours, and couereth our sinnes, and maketh vs appeare iust in the sight of God. Out of vvhich doctrin I deduce this argument: If faith only iustifie, then if we retaine that faith, though we commit al the villanies in the world, they can not hurt vs, because so long as we hold that faith, we are iuste, and so the way is opened to al vice. For if a man be once perſvvaded, that faith only iustifieth, and that this faith is no other thing, but an apprehension that Christs iustice is ours, if he perſvvade him self that Christs iustice is his (as he must, because Caluin & Luther affirme that euery man must beleue so if he wil be a Christian) then needs he only care to retaine that faith and apprehension. For if that only iustifie, then retaining that, he is assured that he is stil iust, though he commit al the sinnes in the world, and so by this doctrin he hath good leaue to sinne. *Supra. The opinion of only faith, openeth the vvay to al vice.*

Luth. in c. 2. Gal. Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 11.

7. And for more confirmation of this argument it must be noted, that Luther and Caluin affirme that Christs iustice is the iustice of al men, and that if al men be not iust by it, the reason is because by faith they do not apprehende it. If then the greatest sinner in the world do vpon a sodain apprehend that Christs iustice is his, then is he iustified without any other pænance from al his former sinnes, and if he hold fast this apprehension, he need not care for amendement of life, but he many lance into a sea of sinne and iniquitie, and neuer feare drowning, because whilst he apprehendeth Christs iustice to be his, he is iust in the sight of God, euen then when he is in the act of sinne, and so as Luther sayth, he need not respect what he him self hath done or doth, but what Christ hath done, because, sayth Luther, faith respecteth not *vvhat I haue done, vvhat I haue sinned, vvhat I haue deserued, but vvhat Christ hath done and deserued*: which is to loose the bridle to al vice. Because if we respect only what Christ hath done, we need not care whath we our selues do. VVherfore although Luther sometimes for very shame of the vvorld, affirmeth that good workes are necessarie, aad that true faith can not be vvithout them; yet because he seeth that in thus saying he speaketh with no consequence, sometymes he granteth in plaine vvords the conclusion vvhich I haue inferred, to wit, that if faith only iustifierh, good vvorks are not necessarie, and euil vvorks are not to be feared: These are his vvords vvhich shal be my conclusion: *Sola fides Christi necessaria est ad salutem, ceteri omnia liberrima, neque præcepta amplius neque prohibita: Only the faith of Christ* (to wit that Christs iustice is ours) *is necessarie vnto saluation, al other things are most free, neither commaunded any more, nor prohibited.*

Comment. in c. 3. Gal.

in c. 2. Gal.

8. So that if a man beleue that Christs iustice is his, he needeth not to care for fulfilling the commandments, because nothing is commanded him, neither need he to feare fornications, adulteries, murdes, and such like treacheries, for none of al these villanies are forbidden him. But let the indifferent reader be iudge, vvhether this doctrin be of God or the deuil, vvhich so fauoureth sinne, vvhich God forbideth and the deuil alloweth, & whether that this faith of theirs be like to be our iustification, which looseth the bridle to al licentious liuing.

The third Chapter shevveth hovv Caluin and Luther in assuring men by an assured faith of election, remission of sinnes, iustice, and perseuerance in the same, loose the bridle vnto al iniquitie.

ALL is not gold that glistereth, as the common prouerb wil witnes, and al is not true that seemeth true, as the Philosopher doth tel vs, because (sayth he) many falsities, many times are more plausible and probable, then truthes and verities. And not to go far for an example: to say with Luther and Caluin that by faith we are assured of our saluation, and acertained that Christs iustice is ours, and that consequently vvhat soeuer our ovvne life be, we may boldly rely on him as children on their father crying *Abba pater*, because by his iustice and not by our owne, we must looke for saluation; hath a goodly shew and lustre, and seemeth a doctrin most pious and plausible. But who so wel examineth the same, shal find, that this is the doctrin especially, vvhich lulleth men a sleep in al impietie, and like popple-seed or cold poison, casteth them into such a deepe and dead lethargie, that they heare no clamors, and feele no remorses of conscience.

2. Martin Luther in a certain booke which he made of the works of the first commandment, preferreth faith as the principal vvorship of God, and defineth it to be an assured confidence, and confident assurance, by vvhich vve are assured that vve are iust. And in an other place thus he pronounceth: *Crede eum tibi fore salutem & misericordiam, & ita erit sine dubio: Beleue that Christ vvil be thy saluation and mercie, and so it shal be vndoubtedly.* See what a compendious & neere way to heauen Luther hath found out. If you be clogged with al the sinnes in the world, beleue that you are iust (which is easie to do) and that you shal be saued, and then vndoubtedly, Luthers soule for yours, you shal be saued: & because so long as you beleue that you are iust, you are in deed iust, you can not be damned so long as you can beleue, how il soeuer you liue in the mean time. VVherfore the same Luther auoucheth that a Christian man is so rich & on so sure a ground, that he can not damne him

Comment. in c. 2. Gal.

l. de captiuit. Babil.

him self though he would, vnles he wil not beleue; and what must he beleue? that he is iust, or that he shal be saued. These are his words: *Tam diues est homo Christianus vt se damnare non poterit quantumuis velit, nisi sola incredulitate. So rich is a Christian man that he can not damne him self though he would, but only by incredulitte.* And what is the incredulitie vvhich only damneth him? not incredulitie of the Incarnation, Trinitie, Passion, or Resurrection; but of his owne saluation. So that liue he how il soeuer he wil, and be he neuer so incredulous in the articles of his beleefe, yet if he beleue that he shal be saued, it shal be so. And beleue he the mysteries of our faith neuer so firmely, liue he neuer so regularly, yet if he feare his owne saluation, he shal be dãned, because only this assured faith of saluation saueth, and only want of this fayth damneth, if Luther may be beleued.

Luthers faith vvhich saueth, and is infidelitie vvhich damneth.

3. Caluin in this doctrin subscribeth to Luther, and shaketh hands very freindly: these are his words: *Vve shal haue a perfect definition of faith, if vve say that it is a stedfast and assured knovvledg of Gods vvil tovvards vs.* And this only assured knovvledge of saluation and Gods good vvil towards vs, he calleth the iustifying fairh: for (saith he) the vngodly may beleue that there is a God, and that the historie of the Gospel and other partes of Scripture are true, *But this is but an image or shadovv of faith, not vvorthy the name of faith: but ther is none truly faithful, but he that being persuaded vvith a sound assurednes that God is his mercifull and louing father, doth promise him self al things vpon trust of Gods goodnes. And although* (sayth Caluin) *vve see Gods good vvil tovvards vs afarre of, yet vvith so sure light, that vve knovv vve are not deceiued.* At length to make the matter yet more sure, he concludeth that we are not only sure of present iustice and fauour, but also of future, and so are sure that we shal not be damned. These are his words: *It is against order to limit the assurednes of faith to a moment of tyme, vvhose propertie is to passe beyond the space of this life, and to extend farther to immortalitie to come.* So that according to Caluin, beleue you the Trinitie, Incarnation, Passion, Death and Resurrection of Christ neuer so firmely, yet if you beleue not vndoubtedly that you are iust and shal remaine iust to the end, that God not only for the present time fauoureth you, but also vvil fauour you to the end, you can not be saued: and if you beleue only that you are iust, and shal remaine iust, and at length shal be also vndoubtedly saued, Caluins soule for yours, you can not be damned. And how can Caluin assure him self for vs, that we are iust and shal be iust? hath he had any special reuelation? no, but sayth he I am warranted out of

l. 3. Inst. c. 2. par. 1. Caluins faith.

par. 9.

par. 10.

par. 16.

par. 19. The assurance of his faith.

Ibidem.

Scripture

Scripture that Christs iustice is ours, & so if I wil beleue vndoubtedly that it is mine, and vvil be mine, then am I sure that I am iust, and shal be iust, and can not fal *so long as I kepe this standing.* par. 17.

4. Against this phantastical faith of theirs, I might bring many arguments, but that, as in other matters, so in this, I couet to be short. First, if this faith of theirs be so necessarie, how commeth it to passe that Christ neuer exacted it of them vvhom he cured? For it is an opinion of some Fathers and Diuines, that vvhomsoeuer Christ cured in body, he healed also and iustified in soule. VVhen he cured the blind men that came vnto him, he exacted faith of them, and asked them vvhether they beleued; vvhat? not vvhether they beleued that they were iust or elect, but vvhether they beleued, that he could restore them to sight. If this stedfast faith and assurednes of our owne saluation be so necessarie, how came the Publicane to be a iust man, who was so farre from assuring himself of Gods fauour, and his owne iustice, that he durst not looke vp to heauen. And yet he retourned home iust, and the Pharisee who gloried like a Thrasonical Caluinist in his owne iustice, and assured himself that he was not a sinner as the Publicane and other men are, vvas condemned and reiected. If this vndoubted faith of our owne saluation be so necessarie to saluation, surely the Apostles were much ouerseen, vvho inculcated so often the faith of the Incarnation, Resurrection, and such other mysteries, which is but an image and shadow (as Caluin sayth) of the true faith, and make no mention of that vvhich is the only iustifying faith, and al in al neuer exacting of their auditors to beleue that they are iust and elect, but only to beleue that Christ is God and man, that he dyed, that he rose again, and such like. Truly either this faith is not necessarie, or they vvere very negligent & incircumspect, vvho neuer mentioned the same, and yet so often inculcate the faith of the mysteries of our faith, vvhich is but a shadow of the true faith, if Caluin lye not, and is not sufficient to saluation vvithout Caluins assured faith. Likewise when they made a Creed, as a breefe abridgemēt of al which was necessarie to be beleued, vvhere was their mynd and memorie, who omitted Caluins article of assurednes of our saluation, and election, vvhich is so necessarie to be beleued, that the faith of other articles is but a shadow in comparison of this? If Caluin say that this his article is included in the article of *remission of sinnes*, he is much deceiued: because in that article we only beleue that in the Church is remission of sinnes, but that Caluins sinnes or any of our sinnes in particu-

Arguments against Caluins assured faith

The first.

Mat. 9.

Second.

Luc. 18.

Act. 1. 2. 3. 4. 8. 10. 13. 17.

Caluins answers reiected

particular are forgiuen, is not there expreſſed.

5. Now if Scriptures and the Apoſtles had only omitted this aſſured faith vvhich Caluin ſayth is ſo neceſſarie, it were ſufficient to make vs not ſo aſſured of Caluins doctrin. For if it were neceſſarie, it is not like that the Apoſtles, vvhoſe preachings, trauels, life and death vvere ordained to the ſaluation of others, vvould haue omitted that vvhich only ſaueth, and without vvhich no other faith or works can poſſibly ſaue vs. But ſcripture not only omitteth aſſured faith of our owne iuſtice and ſaluation, but alſo condemneth it, and exhorteth vs to feare of our owne ſtate and ſaluation; and therfore aſſureth vs as much that this faith of Caluin is falſe, as Caluin aſſureth it to be neceſſarie. Caluin ſayth, that by faith we are aſſured of Gods good wil towards vs: Scripture ſaith that a *man can not tel vvhether he be vvorthy hatred or loue*: Caluin ſayth, that a iuſt man is ſure that he is iuſt: Iob ſayth, *although I be ſimple*, that is, iuſt, *yet this my ſoule ſhal not knovv*. And S. Paul ſayth, that although *his conſcience accuſe him not of any ſinne, yet in that he is not iuſtified*, to wit, before his owne eyes, becauſe he knew he might haue ſecret ſinnes, from vvhich Dauid deſired to be cleanſed. Caluin ſayth, that a man may be ſure and conſequently ſecure of the forgiuenes of his ſinnes: and yet Scripture biddeth vs not to be *vvithout feare of our ſinnes forgiuen*, or as the Greeke text hath, *of the forgiuenes or propitiation of our ſinnes*. Caluin ſaith, that a man may be aſſured not only of preſent, but alſo of future fauour and iuſtice: & yet Scripture ſayth that a *man knovveth not vvhat vvil be his end*, becauſe al are reſerued as vncertain for the tyme to come. Caluin, ſayth that a faithful man muſt not feare to fal, but rather aſſure him ſelf that he ſhal keep his ground and ſtanding: and yet S. Paul ſpeaking to a faithful man ſayth; *thou ſtandeſt by faith, thinke not highly, but feare: and thou that ſtandeſt* (ſayth he) *take heed leſt thou fal*. And againe, *he biddeth vs vvorke our ſaluation vvith feare and trembling*. So that either we muſt leaue Caluin, or renounce Scripture, becauſe they are contrarie, and ſtande in plain termes one againſt an other.

Scripture is quite cõtrarie to Caluin.

Iob. 9.

Pſal. 18.

Eccl. 5.

Eccl. 9.

Rom. 11.

Philip. 2.

6. Neither is this doctrin oppoſit only to ſcripture, but alſo to reaſon. For firſt there are many corners in a mans conſcience, vvhich we ſeldom or neuer looke into: For as Hieremie ſayth, *the hart of man is vnſearchable*, and lyeth open only to God. How then can Caluin by faith be aſſured that his ſinnes are forgiuen, that he is iuſt and elect? or if he know, God only is not the ſearcher of harts. And if ther be many corners in mans hart, to vvhich the hart it ſelfe is not priuie, peraduenture

The firſt reaſõ againſt Caluins aſſured faith.

Hierem. c. 17.

enture after al our seeking, some sinne may lurke in a corner which e know not of. Secondly by Caluins owne confession, we must leue nothing but what we find in scripture: and where syndeth he, at Caluin is iust, or that his sinnes are forgiuen? If he find it not, he shly beleueth it. If he sayth that Christ is our redemption and pro- tiation: I answere that so he is the redemption and propitiation of and yet Pagans & Infidels, and many of the reprobate are not iust, d therfore must not beleue assuredly that they are iust or elect, and hey should, they should beleue that which is not so. Christ ther- re is our propitiation, because he hath payed by his passion a suffi- nt price for our iustification and redemption, but yet if that price faith in Christ, together with hope, charitie, Sacraments, and ob- seruation of the law (for al these are cõmanded) be not applyed to vs, e are neuer awhit the better. Thirdly suppose only Caluins faith by which he beleueth Christs iustice to be his (which notwithstanding lready refuted) were sufficient to applie this propitiation, yet for much as Caluin sayth, that good works do necessarily followe a nd saith, I demand of him, whether that he and his haue not iust use to doubt, or at least to feare their owne iustice, and faith also, hose euil deeds are so many, and so manifest. Fourthly, euerie one them sayth, he is assured that he is iust and shal be saued: & yet some them are deceiued, because some of them haue contrarie faithes: y then may not Caluin also feare lest he be deceiued, seing that hrist dyed for al, and yet al are not iust nor elect, though they assure m selues of the same. Lastly this doctrin openeth the way to al ma- r of vice and vvickednes. For if it be sufficient to iustification to be- eue vndoubtedly that I am iust, or that Christs iustice is mine, then th it follow, that as after I haue sinned I may apprehend Christs iu- ce to be mine and my selfe to be iustified by the same: so vvhen I am ued to sinne by the deuil or my owne cõcupiscence, yea euen then hen I am in the act of sinne, I may apprehend that though there is no odnes in me of mine owne, yet Christs iustice is mine, of which, euen in the act of sinne, I assure my selfe, I may assure my selfe also, at no sinne can hurt me, because that assurance iustifieth me. And so e fornicator may thus discourse with him selfe: I confesse (ô Lord) t there is no goodnes in me, and that this act to which I am now mpted, is a sinne, but Christs iustice is mine if I wil apprehend it so, m iust if I wil beleue so, and from this faith I wil neuer be disswa- d, but wil hold it fast euen in the act of sinne, and so I need not

Second.

How Christ is our propi- tiation.

Third.

Supra.

Fourth.

Fifth.

feare this sinne, becauſe if I hold faſt by this faith, no ſinne can hurt me, becauſe by this faith I am iuſtified. And ſo the way is open to al vice and vvickednes, becauſe if a man wil beleue that he is iuſt, and hold faſt by this faith, no ſinne can hurt him, becauſe that aſſurance of iuſtice doth iuſtifie him.

The fourth chapter shevveth hovv in saying that faith maketh no sinne to be imputed to a faithful man, they giue good leave to al faithful men, to commit al sinne and vvickednes.

Luth. in c. vlt. ad Gal. & Calu. l. 2. Inſt. c. 5. l. 3. c. 14. Supra c. 2.

THE reformers are of opinion, as anone I ſhal relate in the next chapter, that al our workes are ſinnes. which leſt they may ſeeme to contradict them ſelues (for they ſay alſo that true faith can not be ſeparated from good works, which ſeemeth to alowe of al the works of a faithful man) they haue found out the way to eſcape a contradiction. True, ſay they, al the workes euen of faithful men are ſinnes, and yet true it is, that faith can not be ſeparated from good workes, becauſe faith maketh God to impute nothing as ſinne, but rather to eſteme of al the actions of a faithful man, as good and laudable. Wherfore Luther in a certain ſermon vttered these wordes: *Vbi fides eſt, nullum peccatum nocere poteſt: VVhere faith is, no ſinne can hurt. And ſo* (ſayth he) *a Chriſtian man is ſo rich, that he can not damne himſelfe, but only by incredulitie.* Caluin alſo ſayth plainly, that al iuſtified faithful mens works are of them ſelues ſinnes, but are by faith reputed as good. VVhich doctrin if it be true, then nedeth not a faithful man feare any ſinne, be it neuer ſo great, becauſe God wil neuer impute it vnto him: and conſequently it ſhal neuer be brought to examination at the latter day, nor puniſhed in hel, becauſe God imputeth it not as ſinne, and conſequently maketh no reckening of it.

Ser. ſuper, Sic Deus dilexit. Sup. l. de capt. l. 3 Inſt. c. 14. ſect 17. & c. 18. ſect. 8.

Pſal. 50.

2. Wherfore Dauid vvho was a faithful man, in vaine cryed God mercie for his aduoutrie and murder, becauſe if he was faithful (as certes he was) thoſe ſinnes could not be imputed as ſinnes vnto him.

The cõcluſion.

In vaine alſo do preachers threaten vnto Chriſtians iudgement and damnation, and in vaine do faithful men feare ſuch bugbears. For

God in

God impute no sinne vnto them, he wil exact no punishment for sinne at the latter day. And so there is no iudgement for faithful people, but only for infidels, of whom notwithstanding it is sayd: *He who beleeueth not, is already iudged*: and so shal neede no iudgement at the latter day. And false it must be which S. Paul and Christ him self sayd: that vve *shal receiue according to our vvorks*, and *as vve haue done*. For after the reformers doctrin we shal receiue only according to our faith. And so if Christians wil hold fast by Caluins faith, and beleue that Christs iustice is theirs, they shal not need to feare either theftes or adulteries, because Luther and Caluin haue giuen them a warrant, sealed and signed with their owne handes, that if they hold their faith, nó sinne can hurt them, because it is not imputed vnto them. And why then make we scruple any longer of sinne? let euery man, if this doctrin be true, follow his concupiscences. For although he commit al the sinnes which either the diuel putteth into his mynd, or the flesh and world suggest, he is assured that they can not hurt him, because they are not imputed.

Ioan. 3. Aug. ser. 38. de Sanctis. Mald. in c. 3. Ioan. Mat. 16. 2. Cor. 5. The cõclusion.

The fifth Chapter shevveth hovv the reformers auouch that al our actions are of them selues mortal sinnes, and hovv this doctrin looseth the bridle to al vice.

VVo be to them (sayth God) *vvho affirme bad to be good, and good to be bad, light to be darknes, and darknes to be light.* VVhich curse must nedes light vpon our Gospellers, who condemne the iust máns good dedes as mortal sinnes, and account the faithful mans euil dedes as good and honest, or as such, that are not reputed euil, but rather good. Luther sayth, that the best works which infidels do, are sinnes. these are his words: *VVhosoeuer out of Christ vvorketh, prayeth, suffereth, doth vvorke, pray and suffer in vaine: because vvhatsoeuer is not of faith, is sinne.* And in his confutation of Latomus reason, thus he speaketh: *Omne opus bonum peccatum est, nisi ignoscat Dei misericordia: euery good vvorke is a sinne, vnles Gods mercie forgiue it.* And in the same place he sayth, that God pardoneth it, in that he imputeth it not to the faithful. And a

Isai. 5. in c. vlt. ad Gal.

Luther sayth that S. Paul neuer did good worke.

litle before that, he sayth that S. Paul neuer did good worke in his life, and that the best which euer he did, was a sinne, though God imputed it not to him, because he was faithful. And yet again before that, he sayth that euen our iustice is vncleanes, and al our good works are sinnes. Likewise in one of his propositions collected and condemned by the famous vniuersitie of Paris, he hath these very words: *Omnes virtutes morales, & scientiæ speculatiuæ, non sunt veræ virtutes & scientiæ, sed peccata & errores: al moral vertues and speculatiue seicnces, are not true vertues and sciences, but sinnes and errors.*

l. 3. Inst. c. 14. par. 2.

2. Thon Caluin although he wil seeme to make a differēce betwixt the moral vertues, and vices of the heathens (for otherwise, sayth he, *if these be confounded, there shal remaine no order in the common wealth*) and although he calleth the pagans moral works, the *guiftes of God*, yet presently after, either forgetting or correcting his former speaches, he

Sect 3.

sayth plainly; *that they are no more to be counted vertues, then those vices which are wont to deceiue by reason of nerenes and likenes to vertue.* And he pronounceth this sentence against Scipio, Cato, and other moral men amongst the Romaines, that al their moral vertues were vices. Then he setteth downe this general conclusion as a final sentence, from which no man

Sect. 6.

must appeale: *Whatsoeuer man thinketh, purposeth, or doth before he be reconciled vnto God by faith, is accursed, and not only of no value vnto righteousnes, but of certain deseruing to damnation.* And he giueth this reason: because forsooth, our nature by original sinne is so

Sect 5. & l. 2. c. 5. in fine.

corrupted and soked in the poison of sinne, that it can breath out nothing but corruption: and therfore, sayth he, *ye shal sooner be wrong out of a stone, then any good worke from vs.* Yea the

l. 3. c. 14. sect. 7. 9. 11.

same sentence he pronounceth not only against the sinful, but also the iust and faithful Christian: that no good procedeth from either of them, but that the best worke which the iustest man doth, deserueth shame and damnation. The reason and ground of this their doctrin is,

The ground of their doctrin.

because they thinke that original sinne hath so defaced our nature, that it hath blotted out the image of God, bereaued vs of free-wil, inclined our nature wholly to sinne, vnabled it to vertue, in so much that whatsoeuer procedeth from this infected nature, is filthy, abominable, and odious in the sight of God.

The iniurie this doctrin doth to mans nature.

3. But thus they first of al do mightie iniurie vnto mans nature, which by this doctrin is rather brutish then reasonable. For if mans vnderstanding be so metamorphized, that al his science & knowledge either speculatiue or practical is error and deceit, as Luther sayth, I see not why man should be counted reasonable, more then a brute beast.

And

And if he be wholly bent to sensualitie and sinne, and hath no inclination to vertue, no power, nor facultie to do the least act of vertue, or to resist the least tentation, then is his nature no more noble, then the nature of a beast, because he is altogether sensual as a beast is, and no more inclined to vertue or able to do a vertuous action then an oxe or an asse. And so the old definition by which Philosophers vse to define man, must be corrected, because they define a man to be *animal rationale, a reasonable creature.* Which definition by this doctrin agreeth no more to a man, then to a beast, because man is as vnable to the works and operations of reason as a beast is, and so is no more man but a beast by Caluins definition. Secondly, this doctrin condemneth al Philosophers and Philosophie, which teach vs, that in the most vicious man that is, there are some inclinations and seedes of vertue, which is the cause that the most wicked man that is, loueth vertue at least in others, hath a remorse of conscience when he hath done euil, blusheth at his euil dedes as not beseeming his nature, and some times doth some good worke or other. For you shal hardly find a man giuen to al vice, and inclined to no vertue. From hence proceeded the moral vvorks of the Romaines, for vvhich S. Austin sayth, almightie God bestowed on them, so ample an empire, and honoured them with so many victories Hence proceeded also the lawes of Licurgus, Solon, Plato, and the rest, and al the moral precepts and vertues of the ancients. From hence also proceed the speculatiue sciences of natural Philosophie, Metaphysike, Mathematique, Astrologie, and such like: which to condemne of error, as Luther doth, is mere madnes: against whom I wil vse the same argument, which Philosophers vsed against the Academikes who denyed al science. Either Luther knoweth that al speculatiue and practical sciences are errors, or he knoweth not: if he knowe not, he is rash to deny sciences: if he knowe them, in denying science he granteth science.

Man is no mã by this doctrin.

This doctrine ruineth Philosophie.

Natures good inclinations.

l. 5. ciu. c. 15.

Hence the lawes of old Sages.

Hence Philosophie.

An argumẽt against Luth.

4. And although I wil not deny but that the vertues of pagans are many times vice, because their end or scope is often times vain glorie, or else some other euil circumstance is annexed: yet to say that al their actions are of necessitie sinnes, is to make man no man, as I haue proued. I wil grant also that sinners good works, as prayer, almes deedes, and such like, are *opera mortua* dead workes, as Diuines say, because in that they proceed not from the life of grace, they are not condigne ly meritorious, yet they may be morally good, and if they proceed from a good intention, and motion of God, which is called

D. Th. 3. p.

grace præuenient, and which is neuer wanting, they diſpoſe a man to penance, and penance diſpoſeth to iuſtification. Wherfore although Nabuchodonoſor was in mortal ſinne, yet Daniel counſayled him to redeme his ſinnes by almes deedes. Which counſail he would neuer haue giuen, if to giue almes, had bene a mortal ſinne. Thirdly, this is to condemne Scripture, yea and God himſelf, who forbid certain actions as euil, and counſail and command others as good: which is abſurdely done, if al be ſinnes and euil actions. Fourthly, hence it followeth that al ſinnes are æqual, becauſe if our actions be euil for that they proceed from an euil and corrupted nature, they muſt be (at leaſt in this reſpect) equally euil, euen as the fruites of a crab-tree are of like ſourtes, becauſe they proceed from the ſame tree, and take their ſournes from the ſame ſappe.

Dan. 4.

This doctrine is oppoſit to Scripture.

It maketh al ſinnes aqual.

It openeth the vvay to al vice

5 Laſtly, thus the way is open vnto al vice. For if whatſoeuer man doth, is ſinne, then if he be tempted to fornication, to what purpoſe ſhould he refrayne? For if he reſiſt the temptation, he muſt do it either by chaſtiſing his body, or by prayer, or by a contrary reſolution of the mind and wil, vvhich if it be ſinne alſo (as by this doctrin is aboue proued) he auoydeth one ſinne by an other, and ſo might as wel haue yeelded to the temptation. And if he haue an other mans vvife in keeping, or his landes, or goodes in poſſeſſion, he can not get out of this ſinne but by reſtoring, becauſe the ſinne is not forgiuen, vnles the thing vvhich is wrongfully holden, be reſtored. And yet to vvl at purpoſe ſhould he reſtore, if reſtoring alſo be a ſinne, as it muſt be, if al our actions be ſinnes? truly he hath litle reaſon, becauſe in reſtoring he auoydeth not ſinne, but changeth one ſinne for an other. Yea if this doctrin may take place, the Prince may as wel vſe oppreſſion of his ſubiects, as bountie & magnificence: ſubiects may as wel rebel as obey; ſouldiors need not to feare murder, pillage, luxurie; courtiours need not to make ſcruple of vanitie, flattery, diſſimulation, ambition: merchants need not to forbeare vſurie, nor vniuſt ſelling and buying: Iudges may take bribes, & pronounce partial ſentences: and the Iurie may as wel giue vvrong, as right informations: the rich may as wel beſtow blowes, as almes on the poore; and beggers may as wel ſteale, as begge: becauſe as theſe are ſinnes, ſo are the contrarie vertues, vvhich are no more vertues (as Caluin ſayth) *then are thoſe vices, vvhich for their likenes and ſhovve of vertue, do goe for vertues*: And ſo no man ſhal need to make bones of any ſinne, becauſe ſome thing he muſt do, and vvhatſoeuer he doth, is ſinnne, and vvhen he thinketh that he doth beſt, his

beſt, his doings deſerue no leſſe then æternal damnation.

6. But they wil ſay that although al actions be ſinnes, yet God imputeth not al as ſinnes, and therfore we muſt do almes-deedes and abſteine from iniuries, becauſe God imputeth theſe as ſinnes, but not the other. Thus they ſay, but yet thus they take not away the abſurditie. For yet it followeth, that an infidel may do vvhat he wil, and make no more ſcruple of one action then of an other, becauſe God imputeth al his actions as they are, that is, ſinnes and vices. And if the faithful and iuſt mans actions be al ſinnes, either God muſt impute al as ſinnes, or none at al, becauſe al are alike, neither hath God any reaſon to repute his almes deedes as good vvorks, rather then his theftes, if thoſe be ſinnes, and deſerue damnation as wel as theſe. Whence it followeth, that we muſt put no difference betwixte our actions, but may as freely and as boldly aduenture vpon theftes and murders, as any vvorks of charitie, iuſtice, mercie, or any other vertue.

The Sixth Chapter ſhevveth hovv they deny fre vvil and ſo alſo open the vvay to ſinne.

SAINT Auſtin ſayth that it is a thing ſo commonly receiued, that man hath free wil, and that he is not to be blamed for that vvhich is not in his power, that the ſhepheards ſing it on the mountaines, Poets in theaters, the vnlearned in circles, the learned in libraries, maiſters in ſchooles, Biſhops in ſacred places, and mankind throughout the vvorld. And Cicero thought it vvould be counted ſuch a paradox to deny free wil, that he choſe rather to deny Gods preſcience, vvhich ſeemed repugnant to it, then to deny free-wil vvhich vvas ſo commonly receiued. And ſo ſayth S. Auſtin, he vvas iniurious to God, leſt he ſhould be iniurious to the common welth, vvhich could not ſtand vvithout free wil. And yet the Stoikes denyed free-wil as vvitneſſeth S. Auſtin, and after them Simon Magus, Manicheus, and Wicleph, and laſt of al our late Reformers, a bad broode of as bad breeders.

Ep. 11. l. de duabus animabus c. 1.

Aug. l. 5. ciu. c. 19.

l. 5. ciu c. 8. 9.

Aug. ſer. 33.

2. Luther therfore vvriting againſt Eraſmus, and againſt free wil alſo, vvhich Eraſmus had proued both learnedly and eloquently, entuleth

Lut. l. de ser. ar. arbitrio. titleth his booke, *of seruile Arbitrement.* In vvhich booke he disputeth with al might and main against free wil. And to set before our eyes more plainly our seruile condition, he calleth mans vvil a hackney, vpon vvhich if Gods spirit chance to sit and settle it selfe, it goeth necessarilie that way to which the spirit spurreth it: but if the deuil bestride this hackney, it runneth vvhether Satan vrgeth it, and hath no power either to resist the one, or the other. And a litle after he sayth, that free-wil is a diuine name which agreeth only to God, but not to man: yea in an other place he sayth that free wil in man is *a title only, and name vvithout the thing it self.* Caluin in this point agreeth with Luther. For he in his first booke of Institutions, granteth that Adam had free-wil before his fal (which I see not how he can grant, because he sayth that Gods prouidence and predestination taketh away free-wil, yea that Adams first sinne vvas committed by the inevitable decree of God) but after his fal, he in him self, and we in him, lost free-wil: and therfore Caluin rebuketh the Philosophers, who auerre that man hath free-wil, and that else al difference betwixte vice and vertue is taken avvay: for (sayth he) they say true, if they take man before his fal. And in his second booke, hauing giuen a sharpe censure and sentence against both Philosophers and Fathers, because they absolutely affirme that man hath free-wil, these giue free-wil his part together with the grace of God: he vvisheth that this name *free vvil* should no more be spoken of, and he vvould wish others, if they vvould aske his counsaile, to forbeare it also, lest that thereby they take occasion of pride, and of a proud conceit of their owne force. And so if vvishers might be vvoulders, we should neither haue free vvil, nor the name of free wil. By vvhich it is plaine, that Caluin absolutely denyeth free wil, as Luther & Melancthon once did, although afterward they grãted it in external and ciuil actions, as buying and selling, talking and vvalking, and such like: but in moral actions of vice and vertue, yea in supernatural actions, to vvhich the grace of God is necessarie, as the loue of God, conuersion, and repentance of a sinner, they grant no free-wil not choise at al. The vvhich opinion is so absurd, that by this a man may see vvhat credit is to be giuen them in greater matters, and higher mysteries, vvho haue erred so grossely in a matter so euident, that not only reason, but also experience proueth it.

l. 1. c. 15. sect. 1.

l. 3 c. 14.

Caluins opinion.

l. 2. c. 8.

c. 2. sect. 8.

Bellar. to. 3. l. 4. de grat & lib. arb. c. 5.

Experiences of free vvil.

3 For first we deliberate and consult concerning some actions & not others; as vvhether we shal take phisicke or no, and yet we consult not vvhether we shal dye or no, fly or no, and such like, which is a signe

signe that the former actions are in our power, else as wel might we consult vvhether we should fly or no in the ayre, when by running or riding we can not escape our enemie. And why haue Princes their counsailers to consult and deliberate, if al things follow the svvay of necessitie? VVe command also our seruants or subiects to runne ergo, but not to fly, or to stay the course of the sunne, because those actions are in their power, not these. VVe exhort men also to leaue this vice, to follow that vertue, and we counsaile the sicke to take this not that medicine, because al these thinges are in his power and free choise, and yet we exhort him not to put awaye his ague, to be sicke no more, and if we would, he would count vs but fooles for our labours, because these thinges, are not in his choise. We are also wary in our actions and heedful, lest we erre or banger: vvhich argueth that vve may do il or vvel, and consequently are not enforced by necessitie either to the one or the other. We are angry also with our subiects for doing certain things, and they meruaile not; and yet if vve vvould be angrie vvith them for not mouing a mountayne, or not carying a greater burden then a man is able to beare, they would think vs mad, if we be but angrie. VVe are angrie with our selues also, and blame and repent our selues, for ouer shooting our selues in vvords, for making an euil bargaine, for eating or drinking to much, for steaping, or such like actions, which is a signe that we might haue done otherwise: else I demand a reason why we repent not our selues, that vve did not soare vp into the ayre vvhen our enemye pursued vs, or the theefe robbed vs? we prayse and dispraise men for vertuous or vitious actions, as for liberalitie, and nigardnes; and yet we praise them not for growing and waxing tal & big, neither do we dispraise them for litle stature, or for not putting forth their limmes. And why, but because those thinges are in their power, these are not, and therfore worthy neither prayse nor dispraise? we aske also and enquire of men, why they did this, why they did not that. As God asked Cain, vvhy his countanance was fallen? Which argueth that they might haue done otherwise. Or if Caluin wil say, that we make enquirie of necessarie things, then let him demand of the lion vvhy he roareth, of the asse why he brayeth, of the sheep vvhy he bleateth, and of the sick man why he wil be sicke, and the blinde man why he seeth not? But to haue experience (which commonly is called the mistresse of fooles, because it teacheth euen fooles to be wiser, and might perswade Luther and Caluin also that man hath freewil, were they not worse then Gen. 4.

fooles, and as witles in this point as mad men) I vvil demonstrate the same by reason also. And first of al I demande, why rewards are proposed not only by Princes, but by God also for them that embrace vertuous and heroical actions? Certes, no Godamercie to him that doth wel, if he could not do otherwise. And why do they prescribe punishments against transgressors of their lawes, if there be no free-wil? Certainly he that necessarilie is euil, is rather worthy compassion then paine or punishment. Or why do God and Princes set downe lawes and precepts, for their subiects to obserue? If they haue no free-vvil, they may as vvel prescribe lavves to sheepe that they grase not vpon other mens groundes: or to horses that they breake not their maisters hedges, to runne into their neighbors corne: or wolues that they worrye not the innocent lambs: or to foxes that they liue not vpon the spoile of the poulterers hens and capons. VVhy are not mad men punished for the euil vvords, vvhich they speake, or euil deeds which they do in their madnes, seeing that thy haue as much free-vvil as men haue, when their wittes are freshest? Secondly, man is endewed with reason to vnderstand not only what the end is, but also what are the meanes to attaine vnto the same; he seeth, that there are many particular ends to which he may apply him self: he seeth also many meanes to attaine vnto the end which he proposeth to himself; as if he propose health, he perceiueth that this he may attaine either by purging, or letting blood, or exercise, or diet. And seeing that the wil followeth the vnderstanding which is her eye, & without which she is blinde, and can neither loue nor hate, neither desire nor feare, it must needs follow, that as the vnderstanding proposeth many meanes, and apprehendeth none of them in particular necessarie, (because if one be not vsed, an other wil serue) so the wil hath freedom to vse which meanes she wil, because the vnderstanding iudgeth none in particular necessarie, and therfore by preiudicate opinion enforceth her to none. And in this may be seen a difference betwixt men and brute beasts, because though they change their imaginations, and imagin one while water to be conuenient, an other while meate, yet that which they first apprehend, caryeth away their appetites by a svvay of necessitie. Lastly, ther was neuer yet any nation so barbarous, which confessed not vertue to be in some of our actions, vice in others: and therfore they prayse the one and dispraise the other: and yet if we haue no free-wil, it must needs follow, that there is no more vice and vertue in our actions, then in operations of beasts, as I shal in an other chapter

The first reason for free-vvil.

The second.

The third.

chapter proue most manifestly.

4. But they wil say (as commonly they say when they know not what to say) that in reasons may be sophistrie and deceite, and that therfore against al the experience and reason alleaged for free-wil, we must beleue the holy word of Scripture, which reiecteth free wil. Is it so? and are scriptures contrarie to reason? I wil not deny but scripture teacheth many things aboue reason, but that it teacheth any thinge against reason, is most vntrue. For as grace perfecteth nature in aleuating it to a higher beeing, & to more heroical actions then of it self it can attain vnto, and in no wise destroyeth it: so scripture which is the booke of faith, leadeth reason farther then of her self she could go, but induceth her not to any thing which is against reason. For so God, which is the author of reason and faith, in ruinating reason by faith and scripture, should deny him self, because he should be contrary to him self. Yea if Scripture should deny free-wil, it should be contrarie to it self, because it giueth as plaine testimony for it, as for any thing. *An obiection answered.*

5. Doth not Ecclesiasticus affirme, that *God from the beginning created man, and lefte him in the hand of his owne counsail?* doth he not say in the same place, *If thou wilt keep the commandements they shal keepe thee?* doth he not again inculcate free-wil vnto vs, saying: *God hath set before thee water and fier, to which thou wilt put thy hand?* To what end doth God say to man, *if thou wilt*, if man haue no free wil? were it not ridiculous, if one should say to a blind man that can not see: if thou wilt, looke and thou shalte finde: or to a lame man, if thou wilt follow me, thou shalt not loose thy paynes? The like words to the former hath Esaie the Propher: *If you wil and shal heare me, you shal eate the goods of the earth.* And againe: *This sayth our Lord God of Israel, If you returne & ceasse from sinne, you shal be saued.* The like speeches vseth almighrie God by his Prophet Hieremie: *If thou wilt be conuerted, I wil conuert thee.* And how often doth scripture exhort and command vs to conuert our selues to God? which were ridiculously spoken, if it were not in our free-wil by the assistance of Gods grace to tourne vnto God. And in the new Testament sayth Christ: *If thou wilt enter into life, kepe the commandements.* And again he complaineth with teares of Hierusalems ingratitude, saying: *Hierusalem, Hierusalem, how often would I haue gathered thee as a hen gathereth her chickins vnder her wings, and thou wouldst not?* What man in his wittes would speake thus, vnles he thought that Hierusalem had free-wil? else might Hierusalem haue answered Christ in *Eccl. c. 15. Isa. c. 1. c. 30. c. 15. Ezech. 18. 33. Mat 19. Mat. 23.*

this maner. VVhy complainest thou so pitifullie of my slouth and ingratitude? knovvest not thou that I can not? vvhy sayst thou to me, *and thou vvouldst not*, knovving that I haue no vvil, and that thine only is the vvil, myne is seruile necessitie? So that it is manifest by experience, reason, and scripture, that man hath free-vvil. And seeing that ther is no page of scripture, but it conteineth either commandement, or counsail, or exhortation, or some one or other of the signes of free-vvil, vvhich are before alleged, I may be bold to say that there is no page in holy Scripture, out of vvhich may not euidently be deduced a pregnant proofe and argument for free-wil.

6. VVherfore although some fevv places are in Scripture, vvhich, til they be vvel vnderstood, may seeme to disproue free-wil, yet rather should the heretike confesse his vvant of skil to interpret those places, then to deny free-vvil, vvhich al scripture almost euidently auoucheth. Let them not therfore obiect, *that God vvorketh al in vs*, that *mans vvay is not in man*: that *it is not of the vviller, nor of the runner, but of God that taketh mercie on vs*: that *God calleth and knocketh at the dore of our soule*: that *God the father drayveth vs*; For I can easily answer, and haue al the Fathers and Diuines to backe me in it, that God only operateth in vs by his antecedent grace, but vve also by vertue of it cooperate vnto his motions: that mans vvay, that is, the vvay of saluation, is not in mans povver in respect of the beginning, because God only putteth vs in the vvay by his vocation, and præcedent grace, but yet by vertue of this grace it is in our power to vvalke in this way; that it is God only, that beginneth al good wils and courses, but supposing his precedent grace, vve also vvil, and runne, but not vve only, but his grace vvith vs, and vve vvith it: That God only calleth and knocketh by his præuenient grace, but we also by consent do open the dore vnto him; that God the father draweth by his motions, but sweetly, without violence, by persvvasion and allurement, not by compulsion.

1. Cor. 12.
Ier. 10.
Rom 9.
Ephes. 5.
Apoc. 3.
Io. 6.
Places of Scripture expounded.

7. But to labour no farther in so euident and plaine a matter: by a great absurditie vvhich followeth this doctrine, I wil demonstrate it to be absurd; because one absurditie followeth an other. If man haue no free-vvil, al vice and vvickednes must go for currant, and no man must endeuour to auoid sinne, because he hath no power to auoid it. Be it then that Maister Minister dehorte me from vice with al the Rhetorick vvhich he hath, let him lay before myne eyes filthines of

sinne, the dishonestie vvhich it implyeth, the offence of God, the scandal of my neighbor vvhich followeth it, therby to dissvvade me from it: yet if I haue no free-wil nor power to auoid sinne, I may answer him that his perswasions are but lippe-labour vvhich he might as wel vse to a beast as to a man. For, vvhat I shal do, that of necessitie I shal do? and as he dissvvadeth me from vice, so the pleasure or temporal profit vvhich vice bringeth, doth so allure me, and the deuil so vrgeth me, that I can not resist, because I haue no free-wil, but must behaue my self passiuely, permitting concupiscence and the deuil to vvorke in me vvhat they wil, because I haue no power to resist them. For as a man that is perswaded that he hath no force to resist his enemie, or the ministers of iustice, layth downe his armes and vveapons, and permitteth them to do their pleasure, knowing that resistance is vaine, vvhen, wil he nil he, their pleasure must be done: so vvhen a man is perswaded that he hath no free-wil nor power to auoide sinne, he must yeeld him self as a slaue to al vice, and vvhen he feeleth the temptation, he must yeeld presently, and acknowledge his own impotencie. And if any man rebuke him for his sinnes, or if God hereafter at the day of Iudgement accuse him, or condemne him, he hath an excuse ready for such an accusation, and a tricke in store to auoid such a condemnation, to vvit, that he could do no othervvise, because he had no free-wil. And so he may commit what sinnes he wil, and no man, yea not God him self can iustly finde fault with him, vnles they first finde a fault in Luthers and Caluins doctrin, vvhich teacheth him that he can not do otherwise.

To deny free-vvil, openeth vvay to al vice.

The seuenth Chapter proueth that the reformers in auouching the lawes and commandements of God to be impossible, giue occasion also of al impiety.

Luth. l. de ser. arbit. Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 7. & in harm. Mat. 19.

I SHAL not need to dwel long on this point, nor w vse any long discourse to come vnto my intended conclusion, because I haue already in the fifth book set downe Luthers and Caluins words, in vvhich they affirme the commandements to be impossible vvhere also I haue disproued this doctrin, and prou the contrarie, to wit, that man hath power with the grace of God fulfil his commandements. Only now out of those premises, an that booke I inferred God to be vnreasonable by Luthers and Calui doctrin, so now out of the same I wil conclude, that the gap is open to al vice and vvickednes. For if a man be once perswaded, that he ca not fulfil the commandement of keeping the Saboth day, if desire gaine, or lucre moue him to seruile vvorks and labours, he wil easil be perswaded to labour, vvho is already perswaded that he can no keepe the Saboth, as he should do. And if he once giue credit to Ca uin that he can not obserue the law, vvhich forbiddeth him to cou his neighbors wife or goods, if he be tempted or moued with suc obiects, he wil neuer vrge him self to withstand such temptations, be cause he is perswaded that he can not fulfil this law, but must need transgresse it, and not only couet & desire, but also inordinatly vse hi neighbors wife, and vsurpe his goods also, vvhensoeuer they crosse the vvay of his desire. Breefly seeing that there is no sinne, but it is transgression of one law or other, he that is perswaded that he can not fulfil any law of God (as al Lutherans and Caluinists are) is perswaded also that he can auoid no sinne, and consequently if any sinne moue or allure him either by profit or pleasure vvhich it implyeth, he can not, being so perswaded, endeuour to withstand the temptation, because that were to shewe him self able to resist sinne, and to fulfil the commandments, and consequently to condemne Ihon Caluins doctrin. And although in so doing he openeth the gap to al maner of iniquitie, yet therin he sheweth him self a true Caluinist, who being perswaded by reli-

To say the commandements are impossible is to open the vvay to al vice.

religion and conſcience, that he hath neither force nor wil to reſiſt any ſinne, or to fulfil any cõmandement, muſt not, yea can not without offence of conſcience and hazard of faith, go about to fulfil any law: for ſo though not in vvords, yet in fact and deed he ſhould deny his religion.

The eigth Chapter ſhevveth hovv in affirming that Chriſt hath freed vs from al lavves, they looſe the bridle to al vice.

THis reformers, as is recounted partly in the third booke and ſecond chapter, partly in the fifth chapter of the ſame booke, are of opinion that Chriſt was no lawgiuer, but rather that he came to free vs from al lawes: vvhich doctrin although I haue in the former places alleaged, yet to eaſe the reader, it ſhal not be amiſſe here alſo to ſet downe the ſame doctrin in other their owne vvords. Luther in a comment of his one holy ſcripture, often tymes inculcateth that by Chriſt we are ſo freed from al lawes, that none of them can bynd vs, or touch vs in conſcience. Theſe are his vvords: *Diſcat igitur pius legem & Chriſtum, duo contraria eſſe prorſus incompatibilia: præſente Chriſto lex nullo modo dominari debet, ſed cedere debet é conſcientia, & relinquere cubile (quod anguſtius eſt, quam vt duos capere poßit) ſoli Chriſto: Let therfore the godly man learn to knovv, that Chriſt and the lavv, are tvvo contraries altogether incompatible: Chriſt being preſent, the lavv muſt in no vviſe rule, but muſt depart from conſcience, and leaue the bed (vvhich is to narrovv for tvvo) to Chriſt alone.* Where you ſee, that he maketh Chriſt and al lawes, euen their owne lawes, ſo contrarie, that if Chriſt ſtand, no law can ſtand, nor haue any force ouer conſcience. And in an other place of the ſame Comment, thus he defineth: *quatenus eſt Chriſtianus, eſt ſupra omnem legem: as he is Chriſtian, or in that he is a Chriſtian, he is aboue al lavv.* And yet again in an other vvorke of his, he ſpeaketh more boldly and plainly: *nullo opere, nulla lege homini Chriſtiano opus eſt, cum per fidem ſit liber ab omni lege: a Chriſtian no lavv nor vvorke is needful, ſeing that by faith he is free from al lavv.* The ſame opinion holdeth Ihon Caluin, as in the former, and in many other places is plainly to be ſeene.

in cap. 4. Gal.

in c. 2. Gal.

l. de libertate Chriſtiana. Supra, & l. 2. Inſt. c. 2. par. 9. 14.

2. By

The seuenth Chapter proueth that the reformers in auouching the lawes and commandements of God to be impossible, giue occasion also of al impiety.

I SHAL not need to dwel long on this point, nor to vse any long discourse to come vnto my intended conclusion, because I haue alreadi in the fifth booke set downe Luthers and Caluins words, in vvhich they affirme the commandements to be impossible: vvhere also I haue disproued this doctrin, and proued the contrarie, to wit, that man hath power with the grace of God to fulfil his commandements. Only now out of those premises, as in that booke I inferred God to be vnreasonable by Luthers and Caluins doctrin, so now out of the same I wil conclude, that the gap is opened to al vice and vvickednes. For if a man be once perswaded, that he can not fulfil the commandement of kerping the Saboth day, if desire of gaine, or lucre moue him to seruile vvorks and labours, he wil easilie be perswaded to labour, vvho is already perswaded that he can not keepe the Saboth, as he should do. And if he once giue credit to Caluin that he can not obserue the law, vvhich forbiddeth him to couet his neighbors wife or goods, if he be tempted or moued with such obiects, he wil neuer vrge him self to withstand such temptations, because he is perswaded that he can not fulfil this law, but must needs transgresse it, and not only couet & desire, but also inordinatly vse his neighbors wife, and vsurpe his goods also, vvhensoeuer they crosse the vvay of his desire. Breefly seeing that there is no sinne, but it is a transgression of one law or other, he that is perswaded that he can not fulfil any law of God (as al Lutherans and Caluinists are) is perswaded also that he can auoid no sinne, and consequently if any sinne moue or allure him either by profit or pleasure vvhich it implyeth, he can not, being so perswaded, endeuour to withstand the temptation, because that were to shewe him self able to resist sinne, and to fulfil the commandments, and consequently to condemne Ihon Caluins doctrin. And although in so doing he openeth the gap to al maner of iniquitie, yet therin he sheweth him self a true Caluinist, who being perswaded by reli-

Luth. l. de ser. arbit. Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 7. & in harm. Mat. 19.

To say the commandements are impossible is to open the vvay to al vice.

by religion and conſcience, that he hath neither force nor wil to reſiſt any ſinne, or to fulfil any cõmandement, muſt not, yea can not without offence of conſcience and hazard of faith, go about to fulfil any law: for ſo though not in vvords, yet in fact and deed he ſhould deny his religion.

The eigth Chapter ſhevveth hovv in affirming that Chriſt hath freed vs from al lavves, they looſe the bridle to al vice.

THis reformers, as is recounted partly in the third booke and ſecond chapter, partly in the fifth chapter of the ſame booke, are of opinion that Chriſt was no lawgiuer, but rather that he came to free vs from al lawes: vvhich doctrin although I haue in the former places alleaged, yet to eaſe the reader, it ſhal not be amiſſe here alſo to ſet downe the ſame doctrin in other their owne vvords. Luther in a comment of his one holy ſcripture, often tymes inculcateth that by Chriſt we are ſo freed from al lawes, that none of them can bynd vs, or touch vs in conſcience. Theſe are his vvords: *Diſcat igitur pius legem & Chriſtum, duo contraria eſſe prorſus incompatibilia: præſente Chriſto lex nullo modo dominari debet, ſed cedere debet é conſcientia, & relinquere cubile (quod anguſtius eſt, quam vt duos capere poſsit) ſoli Chriſto: Let therfore the godly man learn to knovv, that Chriſt and the lavv, are tvvo contraries altogether incompatible: Chriſt being preſent, the Lavv muſt in no vviſe rule, but muſt depart from conſcience, and leaue the bed (vvhich is to narrovv for tvvo) to Chriſt alone.* Where you ſee, that he maketh Chriſt and al lawes, euen his owne lawes, ſo contrarie, that if Chriſt ſtand, no law can ſtand, nor haue any force ouer conſcience. And in an other place of the ſame Comment, thus he defineth: *quatenus eſt Chriſtianus, eſt ſupra omnem legem: as he is Chriſtian, or in that he is a Chriſtian, he is aboue al Lavv.* And yet again in an other vvorke of his, he ſpeaketh more boldly and plainly: *nullo opere, nulla lege homini Chriſtiano opus eſt, cum per fidem ſit liber ab omni lege: for a Chriſtian no lavv nor vvorke is needful, ſeing that by faith he is free from al lavv.* The ſame opinion holdeth Ihon Caluin, as in the former, and many other places is plainly to be ſeene.

in cap. 4. Gal.

in c. 2. Gal.

l. de libertate Chriſtiana.

Supra, & l. 2. Inſt. c. 2. pa. 9. 14.

2. By

2. By vvhich doctrin although they wil seeme to make Christ a more perfect Redemer as before is noted, yet in deed they make him a fauourer and patron of al vice and vvickednes. For if we be freed from al obligation of lawes, then do they no more bynd vs then lawes abrogated: if they bynde not in conscience, then no man is bound in conscience to obserue them: If he be not bound in conscience to obserue them, then he sinneth not in trāsgressing them, no more then in doing contrarie to a law vvhich is abrogated, because euery sinne is against the obligation of one law or other, yea then he trāsgresseth not, because where is no obligation, there can be no trāsgression. If it be no sinne to transgresse lavves (as Luther and Caluin say, that to a Christian such transgressions are not imputed as sinnes) then need not any Christian make any scruple of any action by vvhat law soeuer it be forbidden, and so he may as freely steale as giue almes, and as boldly he may follow his lust and sensualitie, as liue chastly, and moderate his appetites: for where no law bynderh in conscience, al is lavvful that liketh, and so the way is open to al maner of vice.

The ninth Chapter proueth, that in affirming God to be the author of sinne, the Reformers open the vvay to al vice.

See the fifth booke chap. 1

HAVE already related the blasphemies of our new Christians against the goodnes of God, and I haue demonstrated that they are senseles, absurd, & impious, in making God the author of our sinnes, vvhose mercie pardoneth, and vvhose iustice punisheth sinnes, but can not vvorke, or commit the least sinne vvithout preiudice of his goodnes & Deitie also, vvhich is goodnes it selfe. So that now I wil suppose for my premises, that they are of that opinion, and I wil deduce for my intended conclusion, that this doctrin looseth the bridle vnto al iniquitie.

1. For if a man be once perswaded as al Caluinists are, that God is the author and vvorker of his sinnes, vvhat is ther remaining to restrayn and vvithhold him from sinne? he may and wil easily discourse thus with him self vvhensoeuer the deuil vrgeth, or the flesh allureth, or the vvorld entiseth him to sinne. This act to vvhich I am tempted

and vvhich

and vvhich commonly is called a ſinne, is the worke of God as wel as mine, and more his then mine, becauſe as my oracle, (that is Ihon Caluin) telleth me, he vvorketh it in me, and vrgeth me vnto it. VVhy then ſhould I either be afrayd or aſhamed to do that vvhich God not only doth vvith me, but alſo ſo forcibly moueth me vnto it, that (as M. Caluin telleth me) I can not poſſibly reſiſt him? Am I better then he? or can any ſinne be ſo vglye, as not to beſeeme me, vvhich beſeemeth him, vvho is goodnes it ſelf? But paraduenture God diſpenſeth vvith him ſelf, but not vvith me, and therfore vvil not haue me to ſinne. VVil he not? VVhy then doth he vrge and egge me to ſinne? where I am vrged, certes I am willed, and vvilled by him by whom I am vrged. Yea if ſinne be the worke of God (as it is vnles Caluin lye) then is it the effect of his vvil (for, as Dauid ſayth, *he doth al by his vvil*, and as Diuines ſay, *his povver is his vvil*) and ſo I in ſinning ſhal do his pleaſure, and conforme my ſelf to his wil. Let vs ſinne then freely, we do but Gods wil, and let vs not make ſcruple of that, of vvhich he is the willer and vvorker: let vs not bluſh at the turpitude of ſinne, of vvhich God him ſelf is not aſhamed, neither let vs feare offence vvhere we do our maiſters wil and pleaſure: rather let vs perſwade our ſelues that al ſinnes are lawful and pleaſing to God, becauſe they are the vvorkes of his wil, and conſequently according to his wil. But fye rather vpon this impious and licentious doctrin. God forbiddeth ſinne by his law, & therfore would not haue it done; and puniſheth ſinne moſt ſeuerly, and therfore is no author of it: and he is goodnes it ſelf & deuoid of al malice, and therfore can not worke ſinne, vvhich is deuoid of al goodnes, & nothing but malice.

Pſal. 113. 1. p. q. 19. a. 4.

***

The tenth Chapter by many points of their doctrin proueth, that they take awvay al vice and vertue from mens actions, and so giue them leaue to sinne, and to do vvhat they vvil.

Al men grãt vice and vertue.

IT is a thing so manifest, that vertue and vice, honestie and dishonestie, is to be found in the actions of man, that there was neuer any people so barbarous or vitious, vvhich hath not commended many of mens actions, and hath not dispraised many others, and blushed at them euen in them selues, as not beseeming mans nature, vvhich as it is reasonable, so it should be ruled by reason. VVherfore to certain actions, honors and rewards haue been proposed, and to others seuere punishments and chastisments. The vviseſt of the Gentils, vvhose reason by sinne and superstition was least obscured, were of opinion, that some actions were sinnes, and offences of God, and that others were grateful and pleasing vnto him.

Mans end.

For they knew that God the author of nature, as he had ordained all things to their end, and giuen them faculties to exercise those actions, vvhich should bring them to their end; so he hath ordained man vnto his end, vvhich is to liue vertuously, and by vertuous life so to serue God here, that he may enioy him herafter: and therfore he hath endewed him with reason, by vvhich he may know vertue from vice, and good from euil, and a wil also to execute that vvhich reason shal command: so that vvhen he liueth according to reason, he followeth his nature, and Gods ordinance, and exerciseth those actions vvhich beseeme his reasonable nature, and are pleasing vnto God: and when he followeth sensualitie and leaueth reason, then doth he that vvhich is not beseeming his nature, then doth he breake Gods ordinance, and swerue from the end to vvhich he is ordained, and consequently sinneth and offendeth God. Wherfore Aristotle sayth, that wise and vertuous men vvhich liue according to reason, are most deare vnto God. Plato affirmeth that God is the reuenger of sinne and dishonestie: and in an other place he distinguisheth three kindes and states of men: The first of those that liue vertuously, and they sayth he, are sent to the happy

vvhy man some tymes sinneth.
l 1. Eth. c. & Ex Clement. Alex. orat. hortator. ad gentes.
in Phædone.

the happy Ilands, vvhich we vvould cal heauen: the ſecond ſtate is of them vvho commit leſſer faultes, vvhich we vvould cal venial ſinnes, & ſuch ſayth he, are purged for a time (the ſame do Catholiques ſay of them that dy out of mortal ſinne, yet are defiled ſo with venial ſinnes, that they need ſome purging in Purgatorie) and then with the firſt ſort, are admitted to the happy Ilands. The laſt are they vvhich commit enormious and hainous crimes: and ſuch ſayth Plato, are tormented perpetually, becauſe their paines do them no good, vvhich is as much to ſay, as Catholiques ſay of them, who for greater offences, of vvhich they repent not before death, are condemned to a præmunire and perpetual impriſonment in hel. By vvhich it may appeare, that not only Chriſtians, but alſo pagans & thoſe that vvant the light of faith, haue yet by light of reaſon eſpyed vice in ſome of our actions, and vertue in other ſome, and haue deemed thoſe vvorthy puniſhement, theſe worthy ſome reward.

Plato his three ſtates or places

2. And yet if we giue credit to our new Chriſtians, we muſt acknowledge no more vertue or vice in the actions of men, then in the operations of bruti ſh and vnreaſonable creatures. For firſt if it be true vvhich Luther and Caluin teache vs, that no lawes can bynde a Chriſtian, then doth it follow that a Chriſtian can not ſinne; and conſequently that there can be no vice in any of his actions. For vvher no law byndeth, there is no lawe: vvhere no law is, there is no tranſgreſſion of law: vvhere is no tranſgreſſion, no ſinne can be, becauſe euery ſinne is a tranſgreſſion of one law or other. Wherfore S. Paul ſayth that without law ſinne is dead and of no malice. And S. Ihon ſayth, that vvhoſoeuer ſinneth committeth iniquitie, and that ſinne is iniquitie, that is, tranſgreſſion: for ſo the Greeke word ανομία vvhich he vſeth, importeth: and therfore the Grecians commonly cal ſinne by the ſelfe ſame name. And although ſome actions vvhich are of them ſelues euil, are not ſinnes, becauſe the law forbiddeth them, but therfore are by the law forbidden becauſe of thē ſelues they are ſinnes: yet certain it is, that there is no ſinne but it is forbidden, either by the law of God, or of nature, or of man: & therfore wel might S. Auſtin ſay, that no ſinne ſhould be, if no law did forbid it. And although S. Paul ſayth that the Gentils ſinned without a law, and therfore ſhal be puniſhed vvithout a law: yet he excludeth only a vvritten law ſuch as the Iewes had, and vvithout that (ſayth he) the Gentils do ſinne, but yet not vvithout al law: for at leaſt they tranſgreſſed the law of nature, otherviſe they could not haue ſinned, becauſe euery ſinne is againſt one

Luth. in cap. 2. Gal & in c. 4 Gal. & l. de libertate Chriſtiana. Calu. l. 2. Inſt. c. 2. par. 9. & 14. See aboue c. 8.

No ſinne in a Chriſtian by this doctrin. Rom. 7. 1. Ioan. 3.

l. 2. de pec. mer. c. 16. Rom. 2.

law or others: and so if no law bynd vs in conscience, no sinne at al can be found in our actions, be they neuer so crossing and contrarie to reason. Secondly they denye free wil, and consequently take away al vice and vertue. For if vvhen I do that action vvhich is counted a sinne, I haue no free-wil, then I can do no otherwise: if I can do no otherwise, I am not to be blamed for that, vvhich I could not auoyd, but rather to be pityed that I am so constrained. And if vvhen I pray to God, or giue almes to the poore, I can do no otherwise, (as I can not if I haue no free-wil) I am not prayse vvorthy, because no God-mercie to him that doth wel vnawares, or vvhether he wil or no. Wherfore we commend those most vvhich do wel freely and of their owne choise, & vvhere we see men by feare or cõpulsion are driuen to wel doing, we commend them the lesse, by how much greater was the constrainte: which is a signe that free choise, more or lesse, is necessary to the making of a vertuous action. Thirdly they say that God imputeth no sinne vnto a faithful man: vvhence it followeth that there is no sinne in their actions, or that God is deceiued, or is no right esteemer of things. But this they wil not say, and therfore must auouch, that there is no sinne in Christians actions. Fourthly (although herin they speake not with that consequence vvhich might haue been expected of men of reason) they affirme that al our actions, euen those that go for best, are of them selues mortal sinnes, vvhich deserue no better reward then eternal damnation: vvhich if it be true, thence must needs follow, that there is not any vertue in our actions, because vvhere vice is, vertue can not be: and so vertue vvhich proceedeth not but *ex integra causa, from an intier cause*, is cleane taken away. Fifthly they affirme that God is the author of al our sinnes, and seeing that his wil is his power, by vvhich he causeth al things, sinne is according to his wil: yea they affirme that he moueth vs and leggeth vs to sinne, vvhich is a signe that he wil haue vs sinne. If sinne then be according to Gods wil, it can not offend him; but rather please him, because then we are pleased vvhen things do fal out according to our wil and desire: & seeing that vvhere no offence is, there can be no sinne, it followeth, that if God be the author of sinne, then sinne is no sinne at al.

Luth. l. de seruo arb. & in assert. art 36. Calu l. 1. Inst. c. 15. par. 8 l. 2. c. 2. See aboue chap 6.

No vertue, no merit in our actions by this doctrin.

Luth ser. super Sic Deus dilexit. Calu. l. 2. Inst. c. 14. & 18. See aboue chap. 4.

No sinne by this doctrin.

Luth. in c. vlt. Gal. Calu l. 2. Inst c. 5. l. 3. c. 14. See aboue chap 5.

Calu. l 4. Inst. c. 23. l. 2. c 4. l. 1. c. 17. See aboue, booke 5. chap. 1.

Sinne pleaseth God by this doctrin.

2. Out of these opinions I gather, that neither sinne nor vertue is remaining in mens actions, and consequently if this doctrin be true, no man needeth to feare sinne or to care for vertue, because this word, *vertue*, is but a word vvhich hath no thinge answerable vnto it: and this name, *sinne*, is but a bullibag or bugbear, deuised and inuented to

scarre

ſcarre fooles with al, becauſe according to the new religion, there is no more ſinne in the actions of men, then of brutiſh beaſtes.

The eleuenth Chapter ſhevveth, hovv they take avvay al conſcience, and ſo alſo open the vvay to al vice.

SO careful is our heauenly father, leſt we ſhould commit any ſinne, that he hath prouided, not one or twoe, but many and ſundry meanes to reſtrayn vs from it, as being the only thing vvhich diſpleaſeth and preiudiceth vs. He hath engrauen in our harts a law of nature and reaſon, vvhich dictateth vnto vs vvhat is good and vvhat is euil, and commandeth vs to embrace the one, and to auoid the other: by reaſon of vvhich law the Gentils (as S. Paul ſayth) could not plead ignorance for an excuſe for their ſinnes, becauſe they had a law written in their hartes, by vvhich they might haue ſquared their actions, and directed their liues according vnto reaſon, and within the bonds of nature. To this law before Chriſts comming, he added a vvritten law for our better direction in the way of vertue, not only natural, but alſo ſupernatural. And vvhen the fulnes of tyme, that is, the tyme of Chriſt and the new law, was come, he gaue vs an other law more perfect then the old, vvhich therfore leadeth vs to greater perfection And becauſe lawes are mute, vvhich can not ſpeake nor interprete them ſelues, and if they be not put in execution, they are eaſily contemned: he hath appointed interpretors, ſuch as are our Paſtors and Doctors, to expound this law vnto vs, and Magiſtrats alſo to ſee it put in execution, and to puniſh the tranſgreſſors. But leſt that we ſhould take our libertie in ſinning, vvhen we can auoide the rigour of the law, & the eye of the Magiſtrate; he hath lodged in our boſoms, a ſeuere iudge and monitor, called Conſcience, vvhich keepeth vs in awe, and maketh vs feare to ſinne, euen then, vvhen ſecrecie promiſeth ſecuritie. Wherfore Origen calleth conſcience a corrector & correcting ſpirit, becauſe it puniſheth and amendeth our faults and diſorders yea he calleth it alſo a Pedagoge and Schoolmaiſter, becauſe it inſtructeth vs and teacheth vs our duties, & kepeth vs in no leſſe awe then doth the Schoolmaiſter his ſchollers

Meanes to auoid ſinne.
The lavv of nature and reaſon.
Rom. 1.
The lavv of Moyſes.
The lavv of Grace.
Paſtors.
Magiſtrats.
Conſcience.
l. 2. in c. 1. Ep. ad Rom.

Ex Th. 1. p. q. 71. a. 11. S. Damascen calleth conscience the eye of the soule, because it layeth al our actions open vnto the vew of the soule, and ruleth our whole life, as the eye doth the body.

Conscience is a lawe. 2. This conscience like a lawe telleth vs what in euery particular circumstance is lawful, what vnlawful: like a witnes it accuseth vs, and bringeth in euidence against vs: like a Iudge it condemneth vs as guiltie, when we haue committed a fault, and declareth vs innocent of the fact when we haue not done it: & like an executioner or minister of iustice, it tormenteth vs, and layth vpon vs our dew paine and punishment. That conscience is a lawe, we easily perceiue, and know by daily experience in our selues. For when natural reason and our *Synderesis.* Synderesis telleth vs, that vice is to be eschewed, and that fornication is a vice, conscience concludeth, *ergo* thou mayst not commit it: and if notwithstanding consciences prohibition, we do commit the same, we do against conscience, & transgresse the law of conscience, which always in particular doth dictate vnto vs, what is to be embraced, and what is to be eschewed. When the lasciuious man is moued vnto lust, conscience like a law forbiddeth him, and when the theefe is tempted vnto theste, conscience sayth he must not commit it, because he must not do that to an other, which he would not haue done to him selfe. And if a friend leaue a iewel with his friend, to which none but they two are priuie, conscience wil vrge him to restitution, and command him to restore that, to which the Princes, law can not compel him, because it medleth not with secrets. And so conscience is a lawe, and so rigorous a lawe, that it admitteth no excuse, no cloake, nor dispensation.

Conscience is also a witnes 3. It is a witnes also, which accuseth vs euen of our secret sinnes, and works of darkenes, and proueth vs guiltie before the Diuine tribunal. And whether thou be in bed or at borde, at home or abroad, in company or alone, it stil cryeth against the, *guiltie*. And if thou seekest by silence to put this witnes to silence, or by stopping the eares of thy soule, not to giue eare vnto him, he wil always busse in thy eares, that which thou wouldst not heare, and wil so plainly conuict the, that thou canst not deny the fault. When Adam and Eue had eaten of the forbidden fruite, before God accused them or tooke notice of the matter, their owne conscience accused them, and so plainly conuicted them, that they went & hid their heads in a bush for shame. *Gen. 3.* Cain also their vnto-ward sonne, had no sooner made oblation of his niggardly sacrifice, but conscience accused him, and brought in such *Gen. 4.*

euidence

uidence againſt him, that he changed countenance like a guiltie perſon, and hong down his head like a ſheep-biter. And he had no ſooner butchered his innocent brother Abel, but Abels blood cryed vengeance againſt him. And thinke you that conſcience held his peace? No, no, this witnes cryed out ſo ſhrilly againſt him, that he cryed *peccaui*, and acknowledged his fault to be ſo great, that Gods mercie was not able to forgiue it. Likewiſe the brethern of Ioſeph after that they had moſt traiterouſly ſold him, and vvith a bloody coat had couered all the matter, and cleared them ſelues alſo before their father: yet ſtil, eſpecially vvhen any aduerſitie croſſed them) their conſcience accuſed them, and made them to confeſſe, that iuſtly their deſignements vvere croſſed for the vnkind part vvhich they had played vvith their brother. So that the old prouerb herin is verified: *conſcientia mille teſtes, conſcience is a thouſand vvitneſſes.* Gen. 4. Gen. 42. 44.

4. Neither is conſcience a lavv and vvitnes only: it is a Iudge alſo, vvhich condemneth vs if we be guiltie, and abſolueth vs alſo, if vve be innocent and guiltles. Cain you ſee hangeth down his head like a condemned man, and confeſſeth the ſentence iuſt: only his error was that he appealed not from the tribunal of conſcience, to the high Iudge God himſelf, who vvould haue ſhewed mercie, if he had not deſpayred of mercie. Conſcience condemned Manaſſes, Dauid, Marie Magdalen, and al thoſe pænitent ſinners vvhich ſcripture hath recorded, and that vvith ſuch euidence, that they confeſſed them ſelues guiltie, and the ſentence iuſt. And vve ſee by experience, that vvhen vve ſeeke to excuſe and flatter our ſelues, conſcience vvil not be flattred, but like an incorrupt Iudge pronounceth ſentence againſt vs, euen then vvhen before Princes tribunals vve be freed and abſolued. *Conſcience is a iudge alſo.* Gen. 4. 2. Paral. 33. Pſal. 50. Luc. 7.

5. Conſcience hauing pronounced ſentence like a Iudge, executeth the ſentence, and puniſheth vs like an executioner, and miniſter of Iuſtice, cauſing in our mynds, vvher the ſinne vvas contriued and conceiued, a certain remorſe and vvorme of conſcience, vvhoſe gnaving tormenteth vs. So that vvhen the ſoule hath conceiued ſinne, and borne it alſo, and brought it to light by external action, farre othervviſe doth this impious impe torment her, then doth the litle infant the vvoman great vvith child. For the vvoman conceiueth vvith pleaſure, and though ſhe beare vvith paine, yet after that ſhe is deliuered and brought to bed, ſhe reioiceth, and vvith ſo ioyful a hart, that ſhe forgetteth her paines in bearing. But the ſoule, though in con- *Conſcience is alſo an executioner.* *The torment of an euil conſcience.*

in conceiuing sinne she finde some pleasure, yet not without some murmuring and grudging of conscience, and when she is deliuered of this bastardly Impe, then beginneth her torment. Iudas was so inwardly vexed and tormented after he had conceiued and contriued his treason against his louing and innocent Maister, that for an ease he went and hanged him self, counting that a lesse punishment then the torment of conscience. And true it is which the scripture sayth: *Sum per præsumit sæua perturbata conscientia: a troubled conscience alwayes imagineth cruel and terrible things.* True it is also which S. Austin affirmeth, *that euery inordinate mynd is a paine vnto it self.* And true it is which Iuuenal the Poet sayth,

Mat. 27.

Sap. 17.

l. 1. Conf. c. 12.

Prima est hæc vltio, quod se
Iudice, nemo nocens, absoluitur.
The guilties first torment, is this:
That neuer he absolued is,
If he him self pronounce sentence,
Which is decreed by conscience.

Satyr. 13.

6. But to go no farther, experience wil witnes, that conscience wil neuer let a sinner be quiet, til by penance he hath ridde him self of his sinne, but waking it tormenteth him with remorse, sleeping with fearful dreames: and wheresoeuer he goeth, it putteth hel before his eyes, and the seuere iudgement of God, the abomination of the sinne, and the greatnes of the offence. For as the dronken man, drinketh at the first with pleasure, but when he is dronke, his head aketh, his stomake is oppressed, and al his body is distempered: so although in the committing of the sinne we take some pleasure, yet when the sinne is committed, we feele the smart. And as the aduouterer, theefe, or murderer, after that the fact is cõmitted, hath always the seuere lawes and punishments before his eyes, and feareth the rumour of the people, and censure of the Iudge, thinketh euery man that looketh on him, ready to arrest him, and where men are not, is afrayd of trees, bushes and shadowes: so a man whose conscience condemneth him of sinne, feareth his owne shadowe and the darkenes of the night, imagineth that in euery thunder-clappe God leueleth at him, that euery old hovvse by which he passeth, or into which he entreth, standeth to make a fal on him, and surmiseth that in euery bush, one lyeth in wayte to kil him. King Richard the third may beare witnes of the torments wherwith conscience vseth to afflict al transgressors: for he after that he had

A similitude

An other.

The feares of an euil conscience.

Sir. Th. More in his life.

he had most vnkindly and traiterously butchered his innocent Nephewes, vvhom he should haue protected, was always so troubled in mind, that after the fact he looked euer like a madman, sometimes laying his hand on his dagger, sometymes starting, sometymes soodainly looking back, as if he vvould vvarde some deadly blovv, vvhich always seemed prepared for him. Besides al this, sinne always breedeth a vvorme in conscience, vvhich is fed by sinne, and neuer leaueth gryping and gnawing, til sinne vvhich is this vvormes food, by penance is taken avvay, that so the gnavving vvorme may dy for vvant of food, and conscience receiue ease, and be freed from such a torment.

The vvorme of Conscience.

The food on vvhich it feedeth.

7. Novv contrarywise if conscience finde vs guiltles, she absoleth vs like a Iudge by sentence, and cleareth vs euen then, vvhen men condemne vs, and declaring invvardly our innocencie before God and our owne soule, recreateth the minde and feasteth it vvith a banquet of contentment, according vnto that saying: *Secura mens iuge conuiuium: a minde vvithout care is a continual banquet.* This peace folowth a good conscience, which like a good iudge declareth vs before God not guiltie. So S. Ihon sayth that *if our hart* (that is our conscience) *reprehend vs not, vve haue a great confidence in God.* And S. Paul sayth, *that our glory is the testimonie of our conscience.* For although men think euil of vs, and condemne vs as guiltie, yet if conscience cleare vs, that is our contentment of mind, and glory before God. Wherfore S. Austin biddeth thee to think what thou wilt of Austin, only (sayth he) let not my conscience accuse me before God. By vvhich good offices of conscience it appeareth most manifestly, vvhat a sway conscience beareth in the rule and ordering of mans life, and actions.

The state of a good conscience.

Prou. 15.

1. Ioh. 3.

1. Cor. 1.

l. cont. Secund. Man 6. 1.

8. The Prince and magistrate ruleth only the outward man, punisheth only our external actions, because of them only he is able to iudge, but conscience gouerneth both the outvvard and inward man, iudgeth of our inward actions, condemneth them & correcteth them most seuerely as is already declared. So that he that taketh avvay conscience out of the vvorld, openeth e wider gap to al vice and disorder, then if he should put al Princes and Magistrates out of office, & take the sword from them, because these being taken away, yet conscience being left, we shoul haue some guide and stay of our moral life: but if conscience be abandoned, then haue we no ruler nor gouernor of our inward man, yea nor of the outward man, when either secrecie promiseth securitie, or power dareth warrãt vs to go harmles.

Conscience ruleth the invvard man.

The svvay of conscience in the life of mã.

And this the heathen Philosophers could see, yea could not but see: in so much that Cicero sayth: *Magna vis est conscientiæ in vtramque partem, vt neque timeant qui nihil commiserunt, & pœnam semper ante oculos versari putent qui peccauerunt: great force hath conscience in both partes* (that is in good and euil life) *in so much that they feare not, who haue committed no fault, and they, who haue offended haue alwayes the punishement before their eyes* And in an other place he proueth by experience, how necessarie conscience is to restraine vs from sinne. For (sayth he) take away conscience, and what wil he do in the darke, that feareth nothing but the witnes or iudge? What wil he do in the desert, when he meeteth with a man loden with gold, and weaker then him selfe? Truly if conscience be taken away, we wil neuer make scruple of secret sinnes, no nor of publique transgressions, if either by power or bribe we can escape the penalties of the lawe. If conscience be once banished the world bargaines wil seldom holde, and promises wil as seldom be kept, chastitie wil always be in danger, riches and treasures wil not be secure, Princes liues wil be subiect to hazard, false dealing wil be vse in buying and selling, theeues, coosseners, cutpurses and conicatchers haue good leaue and libertie to exercise their artes, and the gate wil ly open vnto al vice. How pernicious then vnto vertue and how fauourable vnto vice is our Reformers doctrin, which (as I shal euidently proue, and therfore briefly, because euidently) despoileth the world of conscience, more necessarie to mans life, then the very sunne it selfe.

Oret. pro. Milone.

l. 2. legib.

The Reformers take away conscience by many points of their doctrin.

9. They say as is already related, that to a faithful man and true Christian, God imputeth no sinne: why then should a Christian make conscience of sinne, which if it be not imputed either is no sinne at all or elsse not to be cared for? They auouch, that since Adams fal, man neuer had frie wil and libertie, and seeing that where no libertie is no sinne can be, for no man deserueth euil for that which he could not auoid, it folowveth that whosoeuer is perswaded, as al must be by their opinion, that he hath no frie wil, must make neither conscience nor scruple of any sinne. They affirme also, that by Christ we are fried from al obligation of lawes, in so much that no law can binde or touch our conscience: we nede not then make scruple of any transgression of sinne, which in that it is sinne, is against the obligation of one law or other, because where no law bindeth there is no obligation, where no obligation is, no breach or transgression can be found and where no transgression, there is no sinne, and where no sinne is, no

Aboue in the 4. c. Calu. l. 3. Inst. c. 14.

Aboue ch. 6.

Aboue ch. 8. Luth l. de lib. Christ. & in c. 2. & 4 ad Gal. Calu. l. 2. Iust. c. 2.

, no conſcience of ſinne is to be made. It is an article alſo of faith mongſt them, or at leaſt a thing neceſſary to be beleued, that the ommandements are impoſſible, vvho then vvil be ſo mad as to make onſcience for not fulfilling the lawe which is impoſſible to be fulfil- ed? as wel truly may the priſoner make a conſcience that he goeth ot to the Church or ſermon on the holy day, vvhen he is faſt chained o a blocke in priſon, and the dores are faſt locked and bolted. Be- cauſe it is as impoſſible, if Caluin lye not, to kepe the commande- ments, as for that priſoner to go to the Church. They are of opinion, hat God is the author of al our ſinnes, as vvel yea more then vve our ſelues, becauſe he is the principal cauſe, we are only his inſtruments; vvhich if it be true, no man nedeth to be ſo ſcrupulous as to make bones of that, of vvhich God him ſelfe maketh no conſcience? And if conſcience be taken avvay, the lavv, vvirnes, Iudge and Executioner re taken away: & ſo good leaue is giuen to play vvhat euil parts you vil, if either we can by ſecrecie auoid the Magiſtrats eye, or by vio- ence and force reſiſt his povver: for then, conſcience being taken a vvay, nothing is remaining to kepe vs in awe.

Aboue ch. 7. Luth. l. de ſeruo arb. & Calu. l. 2. Inſt. ch. 7. & in Harm. Mat. 19.

Aboue in the 5. booke, cha. 1. Calu. l. 1. Inſt. c. 17. l. 2. c. 4.

The twelfth Chapter ſhevveth hovv they open the gap to pride.

I Haue already declared how the Reformers by many points of their doctrin open the gap to al vices in ge- neral: now it ſhal not be amiſſe to ſhevv, hovv they fauourize ſome eſpecially & in particular. And firſt I vvil beginne vvith pride, becauſe that vvas the firſt ſinne, and the firſt cauſe of al ſinnes, becauſe the di- uel ſinned before man, and his firſt ſinne was ſvvelling pride, by vvhich he couered to be as great, and as high in perfection as the higheſt. Yea many are of opinion, that Adams firſt ſinne alſo was pride, vvhich mo- ued him to eate of the forbidden fruite maugre the commandement of God imagining that ſo (for ſo the diuel had promiſed) he ſhould be- come like vnto God in knowing good and euil. And this is the cauſe vvhy proud men eſpecially are called the children of the diuel, becauſe by pride they eſpecially reſemble him. Wherfore that doctrin vvhich

Eccl. 10. Pride the firſt ſinne.

Gen. 2. Ioan. 8 The proud are children of the deuil.

ſtirreth vp a proud conceit in vs, can not be of God, becauſe it moueth to pride which is of the diuel; and therfore if I ſhal proue that our reformers doctrin puffeth vp with pride al thoſe which folowe it, I ſhal proue it not to be of God, but of the diuel.

Pride is a faut of al heretikes.

2. For although pride be a common diſeaſe of al heretikes (for who ſo preferreth his owne iudgement before the whole Church as al heretikes do in that they are heretikes, muſt nedes condemne himſelfe of an extraordinarie pride) yet ſome heretikes by ſome poinis of their doctrin, haue giuen more eſpecial cauſe of this ſinne of pride.

The Pride of the Gnoſtikes ex Iren l. 1. c. 1

The Gnoſtikes were of opinion, that as gold though caſt into the mire, neuer looſeth his natiue colour and perfection: ſo a iuſt man (ſuch as they counted them ſelues) can neuer be ſoyled, neuer looſe his perfection, in what actions ſoeuer he intermedleth himſelfe, though in aduouteries and fornications. Which doctrin moued them to ſuch a conceit of them ſelues, that they thought them ſelues to know al things, and to be ſo perfect, that no ſinne could contaminate them.

Olde heretikes pride.

Ex Amb. l. 1 de pœnit. c. 3.

The like was the pride of the Nouatians, who therfore called themſelues, pure and cleane. And to omit the perſonal pride of Arius, Neſtorius, Luther, and Caluin, which in the firſt booke I haue ſet downe, let vs ſee how their doctrin puffeth men vp with pride.

The reformers pride.

Aboue booke 3. Chap c. 3. 8.

3. They are of opinion, as is already related, that we are iuſt by no other iuſtice then Chriſts own iuſtice, which doctrin who ſoeuer embraceth, he muſt nedes be perſwaded that he is as iuſt as Chriſt himſelfe, becauſe in his opinion they haue both one and the ſame iuſtice: which perſuaſion is ynough to ſtirre vs vp to Luciferiã pride, as is already in an other place demonſtrated. They aſſure their Scholars alſo, that the iuſtifying faith is a ful aſſurance of election iuſtice and ſaluation, as may appeare by their owne words, which I haue in this ſeuenth booke already ſet downe which alſo giueth great occaſion of an inſolent pride. For if when we perſwade our ſelues (as Catholiques do) that we are nether ſure what now we are before God, nor what ſhal become of vs hereafter, we haue occaſion to humiliate our ſelues, *and to vvorke our ſaluation in feare*: then certes he that perſwadeth himſelfe, that he is moſt ſure of his ſaluation, hath great occaſion to become careles, arrogant, hautie, and highmynded.

Aboue in the 3. chap. Caln l. 3 Inſt. c. 2 par 7. 9 10. 16. 19.

Philip. 2.

Greg l. 6. Reg. c. 86.

We haue an example of a noble woman called Gregoria maide of honour to the Emperetſſe, who hauing conceiued highly of S. Gregories ſanctitie, wrote vnto him to imparte vnto her a ſecret, to wit, whether her ſinnes were forgiuen or no: but S. Gregorie anſwered her that ſhe demanded

manded of him a hard and vnprofitable queſtion: harde, becauſe his ſanctitie was not ſuch as to deſerue a reuelation from God of ſo ſecret a matter: vnprofitable, becauſe (ſayth he) ſuch a reuelation vnto you, were not expedient: better it is that you ſhould be ignorant of that til the laſt day, vvhich muſt alwayes be feared and ſuſpected, that in the meane tyme you may vvaſh avvay your ſinnes, by teares of contrition.

4. They affirme alſo that euery man hath a priuate ſpirite, by vvnich he is ſure vvhich is true Scripture, and vvhat is the true meaning therof: who therfore, be he man or vvoman, clerke or cobler, is ſupreme iudge of religion, and is to rely neither on Pope nor Church nor Councel, for faith and religion. Which doctrin hovv high it is able to enhance the ſpirites of men that are ſo perſwaded, a blind man may ſee. And this is the very cauſe why Luther wil iudge both of Churches & Councels & preferre his owne iudgemēt before them al. For although he ſayth only that by Scripture he wil iudge Fathers, Churches, Apoſtles, and Angels alſo, yet ſeing that the controuerſie is not whether Fathers or Scriptures are to beleued, becauſe they were neuer contrarie, but rather whether Luther or they better vnderſtood the Scriptures, he maketh him ſelfe in effect iudge of Church, Pope Counceles, Fathers and Angels: vvherin how brauely he playeth the part of Lucifer, is as euident, as that Luther and Lucifer begin vvith a letter.

See the firſt booke, chap. 20.

See the firſt booke, chap. 3.

The thirteenth Chapter ſhevveth hovv their doctrin induceth men to idlenes, yea hovv idlenes, according to their doctrin, is the perfection of a Chriſtian life.

ALl creatures are created to vvorke and labour, and ſo they muſt attaine vnto their end and perfection, becauſe God and nature hath ſo ordained it. The angelical ſpirits like birds in the ſpring tyme (for heauen is a continual ſpring tyde) ſing prayſes vnto their Creatour, and attend continually vpon the diuine Maieſtie on high, yet ſo that they haue alſo an eye vnto our affayres and neceſſities in this lower vvorld. For the ſupreme Angels receiue illumina-

Al creatures labour, at Angels.

tions from God, vvhich they impart vnto the inferiour, vvhich are alwayes occupied in garding and defending vs and menaging our affaires: and so ether mediately or immediately they are *administrauij spiritus, administring spirits.* The heauens moue continually, for the better and more equal bestowing of their light and influences vpon this inferiour vvorld. The Sunne leaueth our hemisphere at night, not to slepe or to rest him selfe, but to runne an other course in the other hemisphere for the illuminating of those that are Antipodes to vs, vvhich course being runne, he returneth to vs in the morning, and so is neuer idle. The moone euery moneth endeth her course, and euery starre and planet hath his taske appointed him, vvhich in a certain tyme he must accomplish. The earth vvhen she is out of her place moueth downward to the center, and vvhen by force she is deteined, she sheweth by her weight what an inclinatiõ she hath vnto her proper motion. The fire mounteth aboue al towards the concauitie of the Moone, vvhich is his natural place: the water and ayre take vp the midle roomes, where and vvhither they moue continually. Trees, plantes, and herbes seeme in winter to take their rest after their former labours, and in the spring tyme they fal to worke again, and first they bring forth leaues, then bloomes and blossomes, and lastly the sweete fruites of their labours. Brute beasts besides the labours, to vvhich by man they are appointed, haue their owne proper exercise in vvhich they occupie them selues. The Bee is not so bigge in body, as busie in operation, in so much that vvhen we wil describe a laborious man, we say that he is as busie as a bee. These litle creatures what paynes take they in gathering their hony, in making their combes, in disposing & vvorking their hony, & whilest some are working abroad to bring home the matter of hony, some stay at home to order it, some vvatche for the securitie of them that laboure, and al are incensed against the idle drones, and do not only expel them out of their company, but punish them also seuerly euen vnto death it selfe. The ante also, of whom the scripture biddeth the idle person to lerne his lesson, laboreth in the sommer to make prouision for that on vvhich he is to liue in winter. So laborious are these litle creatures, that often they carie burdens bigger then them selues, and that with such diligence, that with passing often times one way, their litle feete do make a path to appeare euen in the flinte And vvhen amongst other prouision they haue brought home their corne to their barnes, they are not idle after haruest is done, but sometymes they are occupied in nibling vpon the

Heb. 1.
The heauens.
The sunne.
The moone.
The earth.
The fire.
The aire and vvater.
Plantes.
The Bee.
Prou. 6
The Ante.
Plin. l. 11. *c.* 3.
Horat. l. 1. *Satyr.* 1.

the endes of the corne, and graines, leſt they ſhould growe afreſhe; and leſt that the moyſture of the earth corrupt their corne, they bring it forth in a ſunnie day to drying, and afterwards they carie it again into their granaries. Birdes builde their owne neſtes and fly farre and often for the tymber & morter vvhich is belonging vnto the making of ſuch a pallace. Conyes worke their burrowes out of the ground, and there is no creature vvhich is not deputed to vvorke in one kind or other. *Byrdes.*

2. And ſhal we think that mans felicitie conſiſteth in idlenes? No no, as *the birde is bread to fly, ſo man is borne to vvorke and labour*: in ſo much that God appointed Adam his taske in Paradiſe, which was to labour and til the grounde; vvhich labour notwithſtanding ſhould haue been no paine but rather a pleaſure and recreation vnto him. For if Cyrus King of the Perſians tooke ſuch delight in gardening, that he caſt the beddes and knottes of his owne gardens, ſet his owne herbes, and planted, and pruned alſo his trees with his owne hands; if the Romaine dictators taken from tillage and huſbandry, returned againe to the ſame exerciſe after the tyme of bearing office vvas fully expired, much more might Adam in the ſtate of innocencie and the garden of pleaſure haue laboured, and vvorked for his recreation and pleaſure. Thus God delt with Adam to ſignifie by this corporal exerciſe vvhich he appointed him, the taske and labour vvhich is neceſſarie for the ſoule in the exerciſe of moral & ſupernatural vertue, vvhoſe operations are called vvorkes. *Iob. 5. Adams labour in Paradiſe. Perier. l. 4. in Gen. Vvhat Adams labour ſignified.*

3. And truly vvhoſo conſidereth the end of man and his felicitie, vvhich conſiſteth in the perpetual viſion and contemplation of God, vvhich is the moſt noble operation that man hath, wil not meruail that the meanes to attaine to this end ſhould be good vvorks and operations. Wherfore Scripture almoſt in euery place exhorteth vs to the obſeruation of the commandements, to vvorks of charitie, iuſtice, mercie, temperance, fortitude, parience and ſuch other vvorks of vertue. And for this cauſe our life is ſome tymes compared to a warfare, in vvhich we muſt alwayes be fighting, or arming, or fortifying our ſelues, or obſeruing the enemie, as ſouldiars do; ſome tymes we are compared to labourers in the vinyeard, who vvorke for wages: ſome tymes to runners, and wraſtlers, who runne and ſtriue for a gole, crowne, or reward. So that our perfection alſo conſiſteth in action, labour and operation. *Th. 1. q 3 a. 2. & 4. Felicitie is in action, ſo are the meanes.*

4. And truly who conſidereth how vnfitting idlenes is, ſo a man wil

Idlenes, howe pernicious it is

wil neuer dreame, that in it sl ould consist a Christians perfection. For idlenes is the mother of al vice, and the very bane of vertue, and no lesse pernicious to mans soule and body also, then it is to the ground

A similitude

of the gardener or husband man. For as the earth not tilled nor laboured, bringeth forth nothing but weedes, as the tree not pruned beareth nought but leaues, and at the length not so much as leaues: so if by continual exercise of vertue, and good vvorks, the seedplotte of our soule be not continually manured and tilled, the seede of Gods inspirations and inclinations to vertue, vvhich are neuer wanting in our soule, bring forth no frute of good vvorks and vertuous actions, but only the breres, brambles and vvedes of vice do ouergrow the soule.

An other.

And as the poole that standeth and moueth with no streame stinketh, and engendreth nothing else but frogges, snakes and serpents, so the soule of man which is alwayes idle and vnoccupied, and neuer moued with the exercise of vertue, putrifieth in her owne corruption, and bringeth forth nothing but monstrous vices. Truly when man is idle, he is vnarmed and exposed to al danger. Then the diuel taketh his tyme, the flesh assaulteth him, the vvorld molesteth him, and he becometh slaue and captiue to them al, because by operation he maketh no resistance. And vvhereas much hurt cometh of, idlenes neuer any exploit or entreprise vvorthy a man proceeded from it. Hence proceed fornications, adulteries, robberies: for vvhen the minde is not occupied in good cogitations, it is occupied in euil, because it can not be altogether idle, but either it is wel or il occupied. Wherfore the Poet demandeth vvhy Aegistus became an adulter, and he answereth thus.

To vvhat danger an idle mã is exposed. Effectes of Idlenes.

In promptu causa est, desidiosus erat: The cause is easily to be told, he vvas an idle person. When a man is idle and not exercited in vertuous actions, vvhich produce good habits vvherby our sensualitie is bridled, and our passions are moderated, then the flesh waxeth wanton, sensualitie becometh effeminat, the passions are vnruly, and the man impotent to al vertue. Wherfore Scipio in one thing was vviser then Cato, because Cato vvould haue had Carthage destroyed, that Rome might enioye freer peace and libertie: but Scipio counted it more profitable for Rome to haue Carthage stand, that Rome might so haue an enemie to exercise her: which opinion of Scipio time proued trueste: for when Carthage was afterwards ruined, Rome thinking her self secure, became careles and idle, and Romaines by idlenes lost their former force & prowes, & became altogether effeminat, impotent & slaues to sensualitie, who before had bene Lords of the world.

Scipio his Counsel.

5. And

5 And yet according to our new reformers doctrin, idlenes is the accomplishment and perfection of moral, and Christian life. For they first of al wil make vs to beleue that a naked faith, by vvhich we apprehend Christs iustice to be ours, is that vvhich iustifieth. and vvhich is sufficient to saluation, vvithout good vvorks, or obseruation of the lawe. VVhich if it be true, Christian perfection shal consist in an abstracted and idle apprehension of Christs iustice, but in no practise nor exercise of vertue, in no labour or good vvorke at al: and so wheras al other creatures attain to their end by action, motion, & labour, man only by idlenes, that is by apprehending only, & doing nothing, shal purchase his felicitie. The artifier shal come to perfection in his art by labour, exercise, and operation, not of one or two but many dayes, yea of his vvhole life, because by continual practise he augmenteth his skil: but the art of a Christian shal require no practice at al, no labour, no vvorking, because according to this opinion, one only act of faith before a man dyeh, is sufficient to iustifie him from al his former sinnes, and to make him as iust and as holy as Christ him selfe, who is the *holy of holyes*: and so eternal felicitie, vvhich is an operation, by vvhich vve see God face to face and enioie our *summum bonum*, shal be gotten vvithout operation, and we shal vvinne our gole vvithout running, at cheue our victorie vvithout fighting, and gaine our vvages vvithout vvorking; that is by an idle fayth, vvhich apprehendeth only, but doeth nothing.

How the reformers fauour idlenes.

Aboue in the 1. chap.

Luth. l. de lib. Christ. & com. in c. 2. Gal. & in assert. ar. 36. Calu. l 3. Inst. c. 18.

6. They teach vs also, that since Adams fal our nature is so corrupt, that al our actions, euen those that go for best, are mortal, and damnable sinnes, in so much that you may as wel and as soone get oyle out of a marble stone, as wring one good worke from the nature of man. Which if it be true, then certes sleeping and idlense is our greatest perfection. For if in euery act we sinne mortally, better were it to sleepe, then to vvatch and pray, better to sit idle and to do nothing, then something, because in doing nothing we do no harme, in doing something vvhatsoeuer it be (be it prayer and almes dedes) we sinne mortally, and so idlenes is our perfection, because better it is to be idle them il occupied. Whence foloweth my intended conclusion, that according to the reformers doctrin idlenes is the perfection of a Christian mans life, and the best and surest meanes to attaine vnto his felicitie and to purchase his saluation.

Aboue in the 5. chap. Luth in c. vlt. ad Gal. l. confut Rat. Lat. Calu. l 1. Inst. c. 5. l. 3. c. 14.

The cõclusion.

The fourteenth Chapter shewveth vvhat an enimie the reformers doctrin is to Chastitie, euen that vvhich is required betvvixt man and vvife.

Chastitie cõmended.

CHASTITIE is a vertue vvhich alvvays hath bene prized at an high rate, & valewed as one of the most precious iewels of moral vertues: in so much that euen the heathens, though destitute of the light of faith, beholding the beautie of this vertue, fel into admiration of it, and from admiration came to be in loue with the same. Lucretia a noble matrone o Rome is famous for this vertue, who being violently oppressed by Tarquinius Superbus sonne, took the matter for such a disgrace, that with her owne handes she killed her selfe, counting lesse of death then of life ioined with such a blemish. And the pagane Poets vvere so moued with the splendour of this her vertue, that they could not see the fowle fault vvhich she comitted in killing her self. For as S. Austin sayth, if it was no dishonestie to be oppressed vnwillingly, it was no iustice to punish her self with death, who had not bene dishoneſt.

Lucretia.

Lib. de ciu c. 19.

In the Vestal virgins.

The Vestal virgins also were much admired for this vertue, or at least for a shew of the same, and seuerly were they punished vvhen professing chastitie, they liued loosely: vvhich yet they did so seldome, that when such a fault happened, the yeare was counted vnluckie, and the citie of Rome was purged, and the Gods appeased with extraordinarie sacrifices. The law of Areopagus punished no lesse him, that by importunitie entised, then him that enforced, because the first abused both soule and body, the second the body only. By vvhich it may wel appeare, of vvhat valew this vertue is, because the diuel as by pagans he desired to be honoured for God in their sacrifices, so vvould he be serued of them, by his Vestals, as God is by his Virgins.

Liu. dec. 1. l. 8. Dec. 3. l. 2.

Ex Gorg. in orat pro Hel

In th lavv of Areopagus.

2 And not only pagans haue estemed of chastitie: but brute beasts also, although they be not capable of true vertue, haue affected an image of this vertue. The Lioneſſe permitteth the Lion but once, and propagateth her kinde but once only, to kepe chastitie, so much as may be vvithout iniury to her kind. The birds called Porphyrions

Epist. h. 7.

In the Lioues.

vvi

vil sorte her selfe with no mo mates then one, and so abhorreth womanish dishonestie, that if she see the wife commit adulterie, she wil bewray it to the husband by hanging her selfe. Yea if this bird perceiue any maide to play the harlot, she wil pine her selfe away to death. The like is the nature of the Turtle, who vvhen her mate is dead, mourneth in solitarie places, and neuer wil admit any other to her company, much lesse wil she do it vvhilest her mate liueth, and so (sayth S. Gregorie Nazianzene) she giueth vs to vnderstand, at what price virginitie is to be valewed. The Storke is such a louer of chastitie, that (as Ælian reporteth) vvhen on a tyme a certain vvoman of the citie Ceres in Thessalia vvas false to her husband, in being to familiar with her man, this bird so abhorred the fact that she pulled out the adulterers eyes. Bees also are so delighted with chastitie that besides that they conceiue vvithout carnal copulation, they wil not stay in their hiues, if their keper be blasphemous, slouenlyke, greasie, vnchast, or impure of body.

Ælian l. 14. 8. c. 5. Plin. l. 10. c. 56. In byrdes. Cirillus. Carm. ad virg. l. 8. c. 27. Georg. Pict. Virgilius Vllingamus med & Felladius. In Bees.

3. And be a man neuer so much giuen to luxurie, yet he experienceth how nature reuerenceth this vertue of chastitie. For vvho is so impudent, that is not ashamed of his owne lustes, & therfore euerie one desireth darkenes, or obscuritie and secrecie to hide them, euen vvhen vvhen he taketh but his lawful pleasure with his wife. And why sayth S. Austin are we more ashamed of our lustes, then other vices or passions? The reason is (sayth he) because the rebellion of the flesh, is farre different from other vices and passions, because these we can vvhen we wil especially if we adde force to our wil, represse and moderate, but the flesh hath gotten (since Adams fal) such an hand ouer the spirit and wil, that though we may deny consent vnto her lustes and desires, yet we can not alwayes quite represse them, be we as holy and perfect as S. Paul was. And this maketh the spirit ashamed, to make so fowle a foyle of the flesh, vvhich as she is inferior to the spirit, so should she be at the spirits becke and commandement. Out of these premises Cicero gathereth this conclusion, that seing man is ashamed of pleasure, it is an argument, that it is vnworthy the excellencie of mans nature, and I wil adde an other conclusion, vvhich is this, that if lust and corporal pleasure be a thing to blush at, then chastitie vvhich is an abstinence from pleasure, is a vertue most honourable, grating and beseming mans nature.

Aug. l. 14. ciu. c. 17. 18. 19 In man. c. 19. Th. 2. 2. q. 151. a. 1. VVhy vve are most ashamed of lust. l. 1. offic. l. 3. Tusc quest.

4. And although in the beginning of the vvorld, when mankind vvas not yet fully propagated, and again after Noes flud, vvhen it was almost

VVhy matrimonie vvas

commanded at first. Gen. 2.

almost ruinated, God commanded matrimonie, yet did he euen then by many signes and tokens, but afterwards more especially, commend also perpetual chastitie as a vertue most commendable. For although he him selfe made the mariage betwixt Adam and Eue, and bad them increase and multiplie, yet he created them of virgins earth, which as yet had not lost her integritie, and he preserued them virgins so long as they kept their inocencie; and so virginitie and innocencie were companions in paradise, and the vse of matrimonie began with miserie. And if antiquitie may procure credit, virginitie must take the precedence of matrimonie, because the woman is a virgin before wife, and a mayd before a mother. Yea although both in the law of nature, & in the law written, the greatest part imbraced matrimonie, and few then did settle their cogitations vpon virginitie, partly because men were as yet carnal and imperfect, partly because mankind was not much propagated, partly because the Messias was not yet borne, & therfore euery one desired to mary, hoping that the Messias might chance to descend from their race (which was the cause why barrennes was then so ignominous) yet euen then virginitie had her followers, & welwillers. Abel, the first Priest we read of after Adam, & the first martyr, was a virgin: Helias, Helizeus, Hieremie, and S. Iohn Baptist, as the Scripture insinuateth, and S. Hierom affirmeth, were all chaste and vndefiled virgins. The high Priest of Moyses law, although he might marry (because that people was carnal and their sacrifices were carnal & so required no virgin Priests) yet he commanded to mary a virgin, and to abstaine from her also when he was to offer Sacrifice.

Virginitie & Innocencie companions.

Matrimonie began with miserie.

Virginitie is before Matrimonie.

The reason of mariage before Christ.

Abel, Helias & the virgins. Ia. cont. Iou.

Virginitie florisheth in the new law especially.

5. But in the new law, which brought more grace and greater perfection with it, and therfore is called the fulnes of tyme, virgins were more frequent. For after that the authour of this law Christ Iesus was borne of a virgin mother, then al the world semed to be inamoured with virginitie. The Apostles which were Christes first Priests, and Bishops, were either virgins, or lined chast like virgins after priesthood. S. Philip had fowre daughters, which liued and dyed virgins. S. Mathew the Apostle in Æthiopia instituted an angelicall college of virgins, to which he appointed Iphegenia the Kings daughter for the Abbesse, which afterward cost him his life, but got him the crowne of martyrdome. Philo the Iew maketh mention of diuers societies, which in the primatiue Church liued chastly. Iustinus martyr affirmeth, that no people was so giuen vnto chastitie, as were the Christ-

The Apostles virg. Hier. lib. con. Iou. Act. 21. S. Philippes daughters.

Christians of his tyme, vvhen (as he sayth) both men and vvomen kept virginitie to the end, and caryed it with them to their graue, yea to heauen for a iewel. The like report giueth Tertullian of the Christians of his tyme: S. Ignatius S. Paules scholar in one of his epistles, saluteth a College of virgins, and a societie of vvidowes, and vvhen he was going to martyrdome, the cogitation of his death, & the lions vvhich were to deuour him, could not put them out of his mynd, but euen then he commended them to his Deacon and successors, as the *precious Iewels of Christ*. Ruffinus also and other Historiographers in commendation of Quene Helena Constantines mother, our countrie woman, telleth how she coming to Hierusalem being the Empresse of the vvorld, vouchsafed to serue the virgins at table, as a wayting maide. And Eusebius putteth amongst the prayses of Constantine her sonne, that he caryed alwayes a great respect to virgins, perswading himself, that God himselfe, dwelled in such chaste myndes. Neither can our Reformers answer with any probalitie, that this was the abuse & corruption of that tyme, because it vvas the vse and custome of the prime Christians, in vvhose memories the life, vvorkes, words, and examples of Christ and his Apostles vvere fresh, and in whose harts the bloud of Christ as yet was vvarme.

Euseb. l. 3. c. 30.
In vita eius.
S. Matthevvs Nunne.
l. de vit. contempl.
Apol. 2.
Virgins of the primatiue Church.
Apol. c. 2.
Ep. ad Philad.
Ep. ad Here. Dec.
Q. Helens respect to virgins
Ruff. l. 1. c. 8.
Theod. l. 1. 6. 18.

6. And if this were an abuse, holy Scripture is the cause of it, which in many places commendeth chastitie and virginitie. The Prophete Isaie or rather God by his mouth, bideth Eunuches, that is, chast virgins, not to complain that they haue no posteritie in vvhich their name may continew, for sayth he, I wil giue them a *place in my hovvse and a better name*, then they could haue in sonnes and daughters, for I giue them *an eternal name* vvhich shal neuer perish. Where he can not meane Ennuches by nature, for there is no reason to promise more to them then to others, because their chastitie is forced, but he must nedes be vnderstood of those Eunuches, of vvhich Christ speaketh, vvhen he sayth there are some that haue *gelded them selues*, that is haue depriued them selues of carnal pleasures by frie election. S. Paul also anoucheth, that *it is good* not to touch a woman, And againe he counsayleth them that are *frie from a vvife not to seeke a vvife*. Yea, sayth he, *I vvould haue al like my selfe*, that is chast and continent as al the Interpreters expound. And although (sayth he) *I haue no lavv, yet I counsail al to be virgins.*

Conſtantins respect also.
c. 56. Aug. l. de San. Virg. l. 19. proof out of Scripture for Virginitie
Mat. 19.
1. Cor. 7.
Ibidem.
Aug. l. de Sanct. Virg.
Ibidem.

7. Yea reason also giueth virginal chastitie the precedence of Matrimonie. For first as I haue sayd already, in that we are ashamed of al

Reasons to proue Chastitie. carnal copulation, euen of that which by mariage is made lawful, it is an argument that such chastitie is more beseming the nature of man. Secondly, man is reasonable and sensual, spiritual and carnal, by reason of his compound nature, and by the reasonable part, he agreeth with Angels, by the sensual part with beastes: and seing that the reasonable part, is the best and noblest portion in him, abstinence from corporal pleasures maketh him most like to him selfe, yea to Angels, because by that he liueth a reasonable life, yea and Angelical, & more then Angelical, who in flesh, and bloud liueth chastly like an Angel.

The first.

The second.

The third. Thirdly oure goods are diuided into three partes, to wit, the goods of fortune, which are riches, honours, offices, and such like: the goods of the body, which are health and pleasure: the goods of the mynd, which are vertues, and our owne willes, and desires: if then it be a thing highly pleasing God, when by voluntarie pouertie, or almes dedes, we despoile our selues of our goods of fortune, for his sake, in his members the poore: if it pleaseth him also, when by obedience we resigne our willes and desires, which are the goods of our mynd, into the handes of our Superiors, and consequently into the handes of God, from vvhom they haue their authoritie: vvhy shal it not be laudable to weane our selues, euen in the flowre of our yeares, from those goods of the body, which are called pleasures, but yet so are goods and pleasures of the body, that commonly they do the soule the greatest domages and displeasures. Lastly if to vse moderation in eating and drinking be a vertue called temperance, why shal not a moderation in pleasures of the flesh and sensualitie (which we cal chastitie) be esteemed also as a vertue?

Our goods are three fold.

The fourth.

An obiectio.

8. But our Epicures wil say, that a moderation in pleasurs is good, but yet as it is vnlawful to abstein altogether from meate, so is it a sinne to renounce al pleasurs of the body. To this vve haue already answer, that the first abstinence is vnlawful, because it killeth the body which can not liue without meate, but the second is lavvful and laudable, because corporal pleasures are not necessary for the bodyes maintenance, and commonly are preiudicial to the soule, and sometymes to the body also. But yet they haue not doone, it is against nature as they say, and preiudicial to mankind to liue chastly. I answer that chastitie is against or aboue the nature of the flesh and sensualitie, by which we agree with beastes, but it is most beseming our reasonable nature, which is the principal part of man, and so is absolutely agreable vnto man, because the reasonable part is that vvhich maketh him

The answer.

Another obiection.

The answer.

ſim a man. And although if al men ſhould liue chaſte it would be prejudicial to mankind, yet for ſome to be chaſt, it is not any vvise derogating: and vve nede not feare leſt al men be chaſt, becauſe it is not a thing ſo easie, but is an harde and heroical vertue, vvhoſe difficultie deterreth the moſt part of men. Such an obiection Vigilantius once made, *If al be virgins* (ſayd he) *mariages shal not be, children shal not cry in cradles, and mankind shal perish.* But S. Hierom anſvvereth him: *rara est virtus, nec à pluribus appetitur: the vertue is rare, and not desired of many*, and ſo it is not to be feared leſt al be virgins. S. Auſtin alſo anſvvereth, that he could vvish vvith S. Paul that al vvould abſtain from the vſe of mariage (vvhich yet is not to be feared) for ſo (ſayth he) the Citie of God vvould be accomplished, and the vvorld ſhould ſoonner haue an end, and Chriſtes Church more ſpeedily be tranſlated from hence to heauen.

Hier. l. 2 contra Vigil.
Ibidem.
l. de bono cõiugali. 10.
1. Cor. 7.

9. Novv therfore it being proued, that virginitie and chaſtitie is laudable, and more beſeeming man then Matrimonie, becauſe it is agreable to man as he is reaſonable, it remaineth that we declare how our aduerſaries by their doctrin do miſprice this vertue. But firſt it ſhal not be amiſſe to diſtinguiſh three kinds of chaſtitie, that ſo it may appeare the better vvhat enemies they are to al the three kinds. The firſt chaſtitie is neuer to haue experienced carnal pleaſurs, vvhich is called virginitie. The ſecond, is to haue experienced them in Matrimonie, but neuer after, and this is widowes chaſtitie. The third is a moderate vſe of this pleaſure in Matrimonie betvvixt man and vvife. The laſt is lavvful and honeſt, becauſe as Matrimonie is lavvful ſo is the vſe of it, and conſequently the delight vvhich folovveth the vſe is alſo lavvful. The ſecond is more perfect, becauſe it abſtaineth at leaſt from future pleaſurs. The firſt is perfecteſt of al, becauſe it is a perpetual abſtinence from al carnal pleaſure.

3. Kindes of Chaſtitie.
Virginitie.
Vvidual Chaſtitie.
Coniugal chaſtitie.

10 To come therfore more nere our purpoſe, let vs ſee vvhat is the conceit of our reformers concerning this goodly vertue. Luther ſeemeth to be of Rabbi Salomons opinion, vvho condemned al thoſe as guiltie of homicide, vvho endeuoured not to beget children: becauſe he labourreth by al meanes for multiplication: and to make matrimonie more frequent, and to giue ſenſualitie a greater ſcope, he taketh avvay al impediments, and obſtacles, vvhich the Church had layd in the vvay of ſenſualitie, partly for the loue ſhe hath of chaſtitie, partly for the greater honour and decencie of Matrimonie.

int. 9. Gen.
Hovv Luther laboureth for multiplicatiõ.

11. And firſt to begin with conſanguinitie, he permitteth and admitteth

To. 5. ser. de Mat. Vittēb. 1522.

mitteth matrimonie betwixt brothers and sisters children, betwixt the sonne and mother in law, yea (sayth he) if the wife can do it secretly, she may ly with her husbands brother, if she experience that she can haue no issue by him. In briefe he taketh away al impediments of consanguinitie, which are not set downe in the old law. In affinitie, he maketh very few impediments: for, sayth he, a man may mary with his wifes sister, with his wifes mothers daughter, with the daughter of his wifes vncle, with any cousin germaines of his wifes cousins. In spiritual cognation, which is contracted by Baptisme, he acknowledgeth no impediment at al, but alloweth of Mariage euen betwixt the godfather, and goddaughter. In adoption also he findeth as few impediments, permitting the father to mary with his adopted daughter. Infidelitie with this man of faith, is no obstacle, for, sayth he, it is as lawful to mary with a Turke, or Iew, as to eate and drinke with them. Vow of virginitie is no hinderance with him, and therfore he being a Freyr maryed a Nonne. The like is his opinion of Priesthood. And thus he maketh the way broader to al sensualitie and consequently to hel it selfe. Caluin in part subscribeth to Luther, for he misliketh much that the Church hath made *spiritual cognation* an impediment, and hath made mo restraintes from mariage then either Moyses or the policie of many countries haue euer dreamed of. And thus they giue greater libertie to Mariage, and endeuour by al meanes to bring virginitie, which is the noblest and worthiest kind of chastitie into disgrace. Luther and al the reformers so highly esteme, and prayse matrimonie, coldy commending, yea by odious comparisons iniuriously despising virginitie.

He taketh away al impediments of Matrimonie.

l. 4. Inst. c. 15.

Caluin giueth great scope to mariage.

Serm. cit. de matrim. to. 5. in 1. Cor. 7.

S. Austin. l. de sāct. virg. c. 13. teacheth otherwyse.

Ibidem.

Hovv Carnal a Prophet is this?

1. Cor. 7.

12. Luther sayth that virginitie only in this excelleth matrimonie, that it is not combred with cares, and trubles, which are incident to mariage, and therfore is a lesse hindrance to preaching and prayer, but as for merite before God, he sayth, that matrimonie is as good as virginitie: yea so was this mans mynd sotted vpon mariage, that he was not ashamed to say, that *matrimonium est velut aurum, status vero spiritualis veluti stercus: matrimonie is like gold, but the spiritual state of life is like an homly thing.* See hovv carnal this man of God is, hovv sensual he is and beastly, that taketh vpon him to reforme the world, and auoucheth him selfe the only man that hath the spirit of God. See how opposit Luther is to S. Paul, he counsayleth virginitie as better, then Matrimonie, Luther sayth it is no better then an homly thing, wherwith it had bene better that his mouth had bene filled, then that he

should

hould haue vttered ſuch beaſtly doctrin. But he wil ſay that it is not virginitie, vvhich with ſo fowle a mouth he thus miſpriceth, but the ow of virginitie, vvhich is a ſtate of life: but if virginitie be good wful, and commendable, why may not a man vow that life vvhich e may laudably lead, eſpecially ſeing that holie Scriptures allow of ovves, cõmanding al to kepe them that make them. Secondly Luher auoucheth that if one wife wil not content ſenſualitie, one may aue mo then one at once, for (ſayth he) this was permitted in the ld law, and in the new I find it left indifferent, neither forbidden or commanded. And ſeing the vvomans ſenſualitie is as hardly ſatisfied as the mans, ſhe alſo by the ſame reaſon may haue many huſbandes at once (vvhich was neuer permitted to the Iewes) and ſeing that o iuſt number can be ſet downe (for if two vviues content one man, three wil not ſatisfie an other) it foloweth that a man haue a *tot quot* of wiues, and ſo may contend with Salomon in the number of concubines.

Pſal 75 Ecc. 5. In propoſitionibus de bigamia 62. 65 66. Luther permitteth many Wiues at once. l. de captiu. Bab. c. de matrim. He permitteth often diuorce, in the very bõde of vvedlock.

13. Thirdly this ſpiritual father permitteth diuorſement in many caſes, not only for bed or cohabitation, but alſo euen in the bond of mariage, and alloweth of them who not only ſeparate them ſelues from the company of their wiues or buſbandes, but who alſo take others in their places. In vvhich point Caluin and al the new conſrerrie agreeth. And firſt in caſe of fornication they al affirme that the partie innocent may mary an other, not vvithſtanding that Chriſt ſayth, *vvhat God hath conioyned let not man ſeperate, and againe: vvhoſoeuer shal dimiſſe his vvife and mary an other, committeth aduoutrie.* And S. Paul not in his owne, but in Gods name commandeth, that the wife leaue not her huſband, and if ſhe leaue him, he biddeth her remaine vnmaried, or to be reconciled to her huſband. And therfore ſeing that Scripture can not be contrarie to Scripture, vvhen Chriſt ſayd: *Vhoſoeuer dimiſſeth his vvife, but for fornication, & shal mary an other doth cõmit aduoutrie*: the ſenſe is not, that in caſe of fornication a man may take an other wife, but only that he may leaue his wife, and therfore (ſaith our Sauiour) *if he leaue her* (vvhich he may not do but in caſe of fornication) *and marie an other, he committeth aduoutrie*: vvhence it foloweth not, that for fornication, he may both leaue & marie an other for. S. Paul ſayth plainly, that if the wife leaue her huſbãd, ſhe muſt remaine vnmaried. Luther yet addeth an other caſe in vvhich the huſband may take an other wife, that is vvhen the firſt wife wil be gadding, and not ſtay with her huſband, in which caſe (ſayth he) I ſee no reaſon

Mat. 19. Mar 10. 1. Cor 7. Se the English Teſt. Caſes in vvhich Luth. permitteth to take a nevv vvife.

why the man may not take an other. So that if the wife of ſtubbernes, or the man for ſome long iourney vvhich he hath to make, wil leaue home for a tyme, the partie abiding according to Luther, is not bond to ſtay the others coming, but may take an other mate. He addeth yet an other caſe, that wiues are ſome tymes ſo crabbed, that although they ſee their huſbandes fal into aduoutries, yet they wil not ſeke to giue them ſatisfaction: and then (ſayth) he, the huſband may ſay: *Si tu nolueris, alia volet. Si domina nolit, adueniat ancilla: If thou vvilt not, an other vvil; If the miſtreſſe vvil not, let the mayd come.* Fourthly he yet findeth out an other caſe in vvhich the man may leaue the wife, and mary a new: to wit, if the wife ſollicit him to ſinne, or be litigious, and ſo he may vpon ſuch occaſions, take ten new wiues one after an other. And leſt he may ſeme to ſpeake vvithout reaſon, he yeldeth this reaſon: *neminem enim vult Deus in incontinentiæ diſcrimen eſſe mi-iectum. For God vvil not haue any man to be caſt into danger of incontinencie.* So that becauſe according to this mans doctrin, a man can not liue chaſte vvithout a wife, if one wil leaue her huſband, or be ſtubborne, or litigious, or giue not ſatisfaction, the huſband may take an other, as often as he wil, leſt for vvant of a wife he ſhould be incontinent. Wherfore Bucer ſpeaking conformably to this doctrin, auoucheth, that as often as the wife ſemeth not fit for the mans purpoſe, he may take an other: and ſhe ſo often as ſhe is weary of one huſband, may take an other. And good reaſon alſo, if Luthers and Caluins doctrin be true: for if man hath no freewil, he hath no force to reſiſt the aſſaultes of the fleſh, if he be tempted: and ſeing that he is not ſure how long he ſhalbe vvithout a temptation, to make al ſure, if one wife ſatisfie not his luſt, he muſt take an other, leſt he caſt him ſelfe into danger of incontinencie. Laſtly Luther affirmeth that man is ſo bent & prone vnto luſt, that he can no more be without a woman, then it is in his power not to be a man: theſe are his wordes: *Vt non eſt in meis viribus ſitum, vt homo non ſim, tam non eſt etiam mei iuris, vt abſque muliere ſim. Rurſum, vt in tua poteſtate non eſt, vt fœmina non ſis, ſic neque in te eſt, vt abſque viro degas: As it is not in my povver, not to be a man, ſo is it not in my povver, to bevvithout a vvoman. Againe, as it is not in thy povver, not to be a vvoman, ſo is it not in thy povver, to liue vvithout a man.*

10. 5. ſer 5. Matr.

Luth. com. in 1. Cor. 7.

in c. 19. Mat.

Ser. cit. de Matr.

How carnal an Apoſtrta is this?

14 Which doctrin if it be true, then euery one muſt mary, and the virginitie & widowes chaſtitie is exiled the world, or elſe he muſt take a queane, and ſo honeſtie is gone. For if it be as impoſſible for a man to liue without a woman, or for a woman to be without a man, as for a man not

What followeth this doctrin.

man not to be a man, or a vvoman not to be a woman, then muſt the caſe often tymes happen, that the man muſt nedes take a queane, or that the vvoman muſt nedes haue a man beſides her huſband. For firſt if the man or vvife be long from home, ſeing that neither partie can liue any tyme vvithout a mate, it foloweth that the vvoman muſt vſe the helpe of her man or ſome other, and the man muſt vſe his mayd as Luther ſayth, or ſome other mans wife, mayd or daughter: elſe Luthers and Caluins doctrin is falſe, vvhich teacheth that a man can not liue without a woman, nor a woman without a man. If they anſwer that he may liue ſome tyme vvithout a woman, then ſay I, that it is not as impoſſible to be without a vvoman, as not to be a man, becauſe in no tyme is it poſſible for a man not to be a man. And I ſuppoſe that a temptation may happen; as wel in an hower, as in a yeare: what then ſhal the partie tempted doe? if he reſiſt, Luther and Caluins doctrin is falſe: if he can not reſiſt, then if he can not mary (as cõmonly there is ſome tyme required to get a wife) he muſt nedes haue a queane. Whence it foloweth, that not only merchant venturers muſt take hede how they go from home, but noblemen alſo muſt not adventure to go ſo much as a hunting, vnles they locke vp their wiues, or take them along vvith them. Hence it foloweth alſo, that when the wife is ſicke, eſpecially any tyme, or when ſhe lieth in, the man may take a new vvife, if he be betempted to luſt. For if he be tẽpted, he can not abſolutely ouercome that temptation, *ergo* he muſt haue a vvoman: but in theſe caſes his wife wil not ſerue his turne, *ergo* he muſt haue an other wife; and if he can not get a wife, he muſt haue a queane. And this alſo in this caſe of ſuch a great neceſſitie, muſt be lavvful for him, becauſe no man ſinneth in that vvhich he can not auoid, neither is he to be blamed, but rather pitied for doing that, to vvhich neceſſitie compelled him. And ſeing the vvoman in this point is as fraile yea frayler then the man, being the vveaker ſexe, ſhe may as often take a new huſband, as the man a vvife. Which doctrin vvhat a vvide gate it openeth to al diſhoneſtie, I leaue to the gentle readers iudgement.

Fornication many tymes muſt be lavvful according to this doctrin.

Vvhat a gap Luther openeth to diſhoneſtie.

Les Actes du Synode de la ſaincte Reformation.

a vvomans iuſt cõplaint of this doctrin.

15. Wherfore very wel doth a certain frenchman in a booke of his, that treateth of the Synode holden by the reformers at Monpeliar, bring in a vvoman deputed for the femal ſex of the Reformed, complayning of this doctrin of Luther and Caluin, vvhich holdeth, that we haue no power to liue chaſt, nor no force nor freewil to reſiſt the violence of the fleſh: for (ſayth ſhe) if we haue no force nor free-

wil to resist our owne fleshlie temptations, it foloweth that we and our daughthers are al queanes, and our husbandes cuckoldes, and not only cuckoldes but horemasters. For if the flesh assault vs (sayth she) vvhen our husbandes are abroad, or if vvhen they are at home, we take greater liking of an other man, either we can resist the temptation, or we can not. If we can, then haue we free wil, which is countrarie to that vvhich Luther and Caluin teach vs: if we can not resist, then are we al queanes, and our husbandes cuckoldes, vvhich is the greatest disgrace to our sexe that can be. Wherfore she demandeth that this doctrin may be changed, else the vvomanish sex is defamed. For either the vvoman to shew her selfe a Caluinist or Lutheran, must yeld to the temptations acknowledging her vveaknes, or if she resist, she doth not like a Caluinist, and so either she must deny her selfe to be a Caluinist, or confesse her selfe a queane.

The conclusiō. 16. But I am ashamed to deduce any mo of these beastly consequences out of these fovvle premises of Lutheranisme and Caluinisme, and peraduenture I haue offended the reader, in raking in these dunghilles, and haue iniured my pen, and paper, in fowling that, and blurring this, with so filthie ordures; yet as it is good to set forth vertue, to allure men vnto it, so is it not amisse to lay open the filth of vice and heresie, to make men detest it. This I am sure was my intention & proiect, and I hope, yea I perswad my selfe, that I haue brought to passe my intended purpose. For what man of a chast and honest mynd, can allovve of this doctrin as the pure, immaculate, and chast worde of God, from which procede and folow so beastly consequences, or who can thinke the tree good that beareth so bad frutes? Yea vvhat wise man can be perswaded, that the authors of this doctrin vvere men of God, indevved vvith his spirit, that haue no taste of things belonging to the spirit, such as chastitie, and virginitie are, in which we folow the spirit not the flesh, and resemble Angels, not carnal men: but apply them selues wholly to the fleshes desires, and therfore haue taken away al impediments, wherwith the Church in fauour of virginitie, and for the decencie of Matrimouie, had crossed the way of sensualitie, and haue giuen libertie to haue many vviues at once, and to take a new, as often as the old displeaseth, or is not present, and when a wife can not be gotten, by their doctrin they permit euery one that wil to take a quean. Wherfore I meruaile not that their clergie is so dissolute, that vviuing and revviuing, and chopping and changing of vviues is so rife amongst them: neither is it strange that

vvhy such vviuing is

where

vvhereas amongst Catholiques we haue euer seene many thousandes of societies that haue professed virginitie, amongst the reformers you shal find none such, but in lieu of them, Colleges of maryed ministers filled vvith their bratres, because such flowers as virginitie and chastitie are, grow not vpon such dunghilles, and such pretious margarites are not to be cast before such filthy hogges. *amongst the reformers, & no Nunries at al.*

The fifteenth Chapter proueth that the reformers doctrin, holdeth a sinner so fast in sinne, that after he is once fallen, he can not rise again.

VVe haue seen in the former Chapters of this booke, how easily the reformers doctrin leadeth vnto al vice in general, & diuers also in particular: now if it did shevv as easie avvay to penance and iustification, as to sinne and iniquitie, and did as speedily helpe vs, it should make some recompence, but in dede as their doctrin tumbleth men headlong into the depth of sinne, so it holdeth them captiues with an impossibilitie of rising vp again, and so is worthy duble detestation. And how shal I proue this conclusion, which semeth such a paradox? Truly very easily and that without running farre for an argument.

2. If you remember they are of opinion that the only vvay for a sinner to arise vp again after he is fallen by sinne, is to beleue assuredly without al doubt or staggering, that he is iust and elect, and that Christs iustice is his: which if I proue to be impossible for a sinner to beleue, I shal proue also that by their doctrin, it is impossible for a sinner to be iustified, or to arise from the fal of sinne, to the high and eminent state of grace. To proue this I wil only suppose one principle and Maxime of Philosophie, to wit that truth and veritie, or at least some probable apparance therof, is the obiect at which our vnderstanding aymeth, and that therfore, as the vvil can not imbrace any obiect vnles it be good, or at least haue some apparance of good (for no man can like of euil as euil) so the vnderstanding can not yeld her assent to any thing, vnles it be a veritie, or haue at least some probable shew of veritie. And this is the cause vvhy we can not beleue and say *aboue chap. 3. Luth. in c. 2. Gal. Cal. l. 3. Inst. c. 2. p. 7. 9. & seq. See the preface to the Reader.*

with hart, that black is white, or that a known falsitie is a veritie, as I haue declared in my Epistle to the reader more at large.

3. Out of these premisses I gather this conclusion: that it is impossible for a sinner, to frame on a sodayne this assent, that he is iust: and consequently, if this be the only vvay for a sinner to rise vnto iustification, it is impossible for him after he is fallen by sinne, to rise againe by iustification, & so vvhere he falleth, there he must nedes lye. For as it is impossible for a sicke man (if he be in his vvittes) to beleue verily that he is vvhole, vnles he see some alteration in him selfe, and find some ease of his disease, so is it as impossible for a sinner who is spiritually sicke, yea dead, vpon a sodaine to beleue (especialy so assuredly as Caluin vvil haue him) that he is iust, vvhole, and sound, and fully recouered of his spiritual disease, vnles he see some alteration in him selfe before he frame so firme an assent. For I vvil aske of Caluin vvhen he commeth fresh from his vilanie, vvhat moueth him to this assent and beleefe, that he is iust and elect? hath he a reuelation? or hath euerie one of his folovvers vvhom he vvil haue to beleue the same, any illumination from God by which they are acertained? He must nedes say no, becauſe they experience in them selues that they haue no such euidence: find they any contrition, or loue of God, or haue they any inherent grace in them, which hath altered them and made them of sinners iust and holy? They vvil say no, for then faith should not iustifie, but that which goeth before this faith. And this they must nedes say, becauſe faith is the first goodnes in vs, and with them it is the first and only thing which iustifieth: yea in their opinion, contrition which is inherent in vs, can not be our iustification, becauſe they say that there is no inherent grace nor iustice. And if before this faith of theirs, God should by infusion of grace iustifie them, yet vnles they had a reuelation, they could not, especially with such assurance beleue it, becauſe the vnderstanding can not giue assent without some apparance of truth.

Impossible for a sinner to rise, by caluins doctrin.

aboue chap. 2

4. They vvil say that Christs iustice is theirs, so that they wil apprehend it by faith, and so they are iust by that iustice, if they vvil beleue so. But neither wil this shift serue their turne. For before they beleue this, Christs iustice must be theirs, and by it they must be iust, becauſe that is the obiect of their beleefe, and the vnderstanding must see it to be so, before she beleue so: wherfore seing that before this faith of theirs, Christs iustice is not theirs, and they also are not yet iust, it foloweth that they can not, so long as they are in their wittes, beleue

Caluins faith impossible.

beleue that they are iuſt, becauſe this veritie muſt appeare to the vnderſtanding before ſhe can beleue it: and therfore if before faith they be not iuſt, they can neuer beleue ſo. For as the ſicke man muſt be whole and ſound before he can beleue that he is ſo, becauſe it is not in his povver to beleue that which is not, or which at leaſt appeareth not, ſo a ſinner can not on a ſodaine (vnles he haue ſome reaſon for it) beleue aſſuredly that he is iuſt. And therfore if this aſſured faith be neceſſarie to ariſe after our fal taken by ſinne, it is impoſſible to riſe again, after that vve are fallen. And to make the matter yet more plaine: as if the only remedie for a ſicke man to recouer his health, were to beleue that he is wel, it were impoſſible for him to recouer, becauſe whileſt his diſeaſe remaineth, he can not beleue that he is recouered, hauing no reaſon to thinke ſo, but rather the contrarie: ſo if the only meanes for a ſinner to recouer, be to beleue in the middeſt of his ſinnes, that he is iuſt, it is impoſſible for him to recouer, becauſe he can not with hart thinke ſo, hauing no reaſon for it, but rather to the contrarie.

a ſimilitude.

a ſimilitude.

5. Hence I gather two thinges to be noted. Firſt that if a ſinner be iuſtified by beleeuing that he is iuſt, then is he iuſtified by a lying faith, becauſe he beleueth that vvhich is not: and if you ſay that ſo ſoone as he hath beleeued ſo, he ſhal be ſo: that is not ſufficient, for yet it foloweth that he beleueth that he is iuſt beſore he is iuſt, becauſe iuſtice folovveth faith, and ſo he is iuſtified by a falſe and lying faith. The ſecond thing which I note is how malitiouſly, and yet how couertly the diuel by his members ſeeketh our damnation. For not content by their doctrin to haue induced men to al ſinne, he taketh away the meanes of riſing again from the ſtate of ſinne, denying penance to be neceſſarie, yea affirming in Luther that contrition is a mortal ſinne, and auouching in Luther and Caluin both, yea and in al their Scholars, that the only meanes for a ſinner to be iuſtified, is to beleue without al ſtaggering, and with al poſſible aſſurance, that his ſinnes are forgiuen: vvhich beleefe being impoſſible, as is already proued (becauſe it is not in the vnderſtandings power to beleue white to be blacke, or that a man is iuſt vvhen no probabilitie of it appeareth) it foloweth ihat vvhen a ſinner is fallen, it is impoſſible for him to riſe againe, becauſe it is as impoſſible for him to beleue that he is iuſt, before he ſee ſome apparance of the ſame, as for a ſicke man to beleue that he is recouered and vvel at eaſe, when he is in the middeſt of the fitte of an hoate ague, or in the

Caluins faith is a lying faith.

the malice of the deuil.

Supra c. 1.

Supra. c. 3.

The conclusiō.

in the panges of death. And so our reformers do not only tumble men headlong into the very depth of sinne, but hold them there in perpetual durance, vvithout hope of libertie, because they require an impossibilitie, which is, in the midst of sinnes to beleue that we are iust, and elect, hauing no probabilitie of the same, but rather great euidence to the contrarie: which is as impossible to beleue with hart, as it is for the sicke man to assure himselfe that he is vvel, vvhen he is in the middest of his fitte.

***



THE EIGTH BOKE
CONTAINETH A SVRVEY OF THE NEVV DOCTRIN which leadeth vnto Atheiſme and contempt of Religion.

A SHORT PRÆFACE.

IRELAND Is famous for that it breedeth no toades, nor venimous ſerpents, and England hath bene of long tyme eſtemed happie, becauſe it hath no wolues: but in ſteed of wolues, it hath bene of late yeares vnfortunate for engendring of certaine monſters called Atheiſts begotten by hereſie, which haue more vvaſted & depopulated the countrie, then al the beares and vvolues of the deſert, or monſters of Africa could haue done, if they had bene al turned looſe into the land. For they could only haue made their pray vpon the bodies of men and beaſtes, but theſe monſtrous Atheiſtes haue made hauocke of mens ſoules. They could only haue diſturbed the temporal ſtate and ciuil peace, theſe haue ruined Chriſtianitie, and brought Religion into contempt, vvhich is the principal bliſſe of the ſoule in this life. Of theſe monſters there are two kindes both feirce and cruel, but the one more ſauage then the other. The firſt denyeth flatly the Diuinitie, and therfore moſt properly is called an Atheiſt, that is vvithout a God. The ſecond confeſſeth God and Godhead, but yet is of opinion, that it litle skilleth what honour you giue him, or with vvhat vvorſhip of Religion you ſerue him. Of this kinde are our Macheuellians, who ſquare out Religion according to ſtate, & make no more account of Scripture then of Æſops fables, and ſo they may liue and eſtabliſh a temporal ſtate, care not vvhat Religion

The monſter Atheiſts.

The firſt kind of Atheiſts.

The ſecond.

ligion floriſheth: becauſe they count it but a peece of pollicie to keepe men in awe and order. Againſt theſe monſters I muſt arme my ſelfe, and change my vveapons as I change my aduerſarie, and by reaſon only I wil confound theſe, as I haue by Scriptures, reaſon, authorite, and al maner of argumentes refuted Heretikes. And for as much as my generall drift and proiect in al theſe bookes is, to ſhew how odious hereſie ought to be, I wil ſhew in this laſt booke, how Atheiſme is engendred of hereſie, that by this viperous and moſtrous brood we may haue a greater gueſſe of the breeder.

The firſt Chapter declareth hovv certaine points of the Reformers doctrin, make vvay to a denial of the Diuine Maieſtie and his Godhead.

Vvhat God is, is not knovven in this life.

IT is ſo hard to Know, vvhat God is, that neither the light of reaſon, nor of faith, nor both lights ioined together, are able to diſcouer this veritie. Wherfore Trimegiſtus being demanded this obſcure queſtion gaue as obſcure an anſwer: to wit, that God is a thing vvhoſe center is euerie vvhere, and his circle or circumference no vvhere: ſignifying therby, that the leaſt thing in God (if a man may ſay ſo of God, in vvhom al things are ſo great that they are no leſſe then God) is ſo great, that it farre ſurpaſſeth the ſphere of our capacitie, much more doth the circumference of his infinite perfection excede the compaſſe of humane vvitte. Simonides being asked the ſame queſtion, required tyme to conſider, after which tyme he being demanded to giue his cenſure, required longer tyme. At the length being vrged to make no mo delayes, he anſwered only this, that God vvas ſuch a thing that the more we conſider him, the leſſe we conceue him, and the more we conceue of him the leſſe we can ſay of him. Ariſtotle the Prince of Philoſophers could only ſay of God, that he is *Ens entium*, *the thing of thinges*, that is the thing, from vvhich al things procede as from the fountaine and firſt cauſe of al things, and a thing vvhich is al thinges, becauſe eminently (as Diuines ſay) & compendiouſly, he containeth in him ſelfe al thinges. Not that in God, they be liuing and not liuing, corruptible and incorrup-

Trimegiſtus opinion of God.

Simonides opinion.

Ariſtotles opinion of God.

1. p. q. 4. 2. Hovv al thinges are in God.

tible

ible, great and ſmal, agreable and diuers, perfect and imperfect, as they are in them ſelues: becauſe al in God is liuing, al incorruptible, al great, increat, and infinite, al one, al perfect vvithout imperfection: to be briefe in God al is God. For as the cauſe conteineth diuerſe effectes vvithout diuiſion and imperfection of the cauſe, and as the artificers peece of vvorke, hath a more noble being in the artificers Idea and mental platforme, then in it ſelfe; ſo al thinges are in God, in more eminent maner, then in them ſelues; becauſe in him, they are as in their cauſe, & fountaine, yea as in their idea: & therfore though in them ſelues, ſome of theſe creatures, be corporal, ſome be ſpiritual, yet in God al are ſpiritual, though in them ſelues ſome be liuing creatures, ſome deuoid of life, yet in God al are liuing *and life it ſelfe*: though in them ſelues they be create, yet in God they be increat, though in them ſelues they be imperfect, yet in God they be perfect: though in them ſelues they be diuerſe, yet in God they are al one: though in them ſelues they be creatures, yet in God they are God. This the learned ſcholar of S. Paul Dioniſius Areopagita, explicateth by a fitte ſimilitude. As the lines (ſaith he) vvhich are drawen from the center, are diuided from them ſelues, and diuerſe in them ſelues, but in the center, they are vnited in one without any diſtinction: ſo al creatures, as they procede from God, who is the center and reſting of al things, are diuers and different, but as they are in God, they are al one. And as the forſaid lines in the center, are nothing elſe but the center: ſo al creatures vvhich are but ſo many lines drawne from Gods indiuiſible nature, in God are God, vvithout al diuiſion and imperfection.

a ſimilitude.

Io. 1. Aug. trac. 1. in Io.

c. 5. de diuinis nominibus.

2. But as vvhat God is we know not, ſo that there is a God, is ſo manifeſt, that though the toungue may deny him, the hart can not, if it be not caryed avvay with paſſion, for inconſideration. True it is that Protagoras and Diagoras were ſo godleſſe, as to doubt, yea to deny that there vvas a God: yet theſe men vvere long ſince hiſſed out of the ſchooles of al Philoſophers, and could not haue denied God in hart, vvhere the light of reaſon diſcouereth him, had not ſome blinding paſſion ouerruled them. And therfore if it vvere not, that hereſie had countenanced Atheiſme, and giuen it authoritie to paſſe amongſt Chriſtians vvithout bluſhing, yea with honour and credit: I vvould haue contented my ſelfe to haue hiſſed alſo at theſe companions, and vvould neuer haue gone about to ouerthrow that by reaſon, vvhich ſtandeth with no reaſon. But leſt that the authoritie and sway, vvhich atheiſme novv a dayes beareth in the vvorld, may ouer

That there is a God is euident. ex Cicer. l. 1. de nat. deor. plut. l. 1. de plac. c. 7.

rule the vviser, & seeme reason ynough to the simple, I wil by certain pregnant reasons, cõuince these godles Atheistes, that there is a God, and a Diuine pov ver. And first of al this world semeth to me to be a booke wherin vve may read this veritie. For, as the booke vvhich we read (if we vnderstand the wordes) teacheth vs the veritie or science vvhich it conteineth so if we read with diligence the booke of this world, in which euery creature is a worde, we shal by it lerne that there is a God. For as S. Paul sayth, *the inuisible things of God.* (that is his diuine attributes and perfections) *are knovvne by those things that are created.* Vvherfore that couragious mother in the Machabees vvhich was as forward to prefer her sonnes to Martyrdome, as other would be to detain thẽ, biddeth her sonne to read this booke of creatures, & *to looke vpon heauen & earth & al vvhich is in thẽ contained, and there to lerne, that it vvas God that made them al of nothing.* This booke S. Antonie studied, & profited therin so much, that he could cõfute Philosophers and conuince a Godhead & Diuinitie. Yea these creatures are not only so many wordes in vvhich we may read this veritie, but they are also so many preachers vvhich cry out with a voice most lowd, and shril and in a language intelligible of al men, that *God it vvas that made them and not they themselues.* And so a Godhead is taught vs not only by the vniuersitie of Athens, Paris, Oxford, but also of al the creatures in the vvorld. For first I demand of vvhom this vvorld (vvhich Philosophers do cal Al because it containeth al) tooke his beginning, being, and existing? If thou say with Epicure or Democritus, that it vvas made *Fortuito causarum, atomorum concursu, by a chancing concurse of causes, motes or indiuisible bodies:* I aske who made these causes and indiuisible bodyes? If thou answver that a creature made them, I aske again vvho made that creature & so at length I wil bring thee to a thing exempt from creation, vvhich created al things, and this I cal God. If thou sayst that the world framed it selfe, I must nedes tel thee that that is impossible because nothing can operate or worke before it hath a being as the Philosopher sayth, *prius est esse quam agere.* And so if the world made it self it vvas before it selfe, which implyeth a contradiction. If thou say that it was neither framed by it selfe, nor by any other cause, but was euer of it selfe, vvithout any making, then thou makest the vvorld a God and so vvhilest thou seekest to deny a God, thou grantest a God. For if it be of it selfe, it is independent of any other, and so hath a necessarie being which euer was and euer shalbe: because if it be of it selfe, it can not by any cause be brought from nothing to something, and so euer

The first argument to proue a God, is the vvorld. Ro. 1. Sep. 13. Act. 14. 2. Mac. 2.

The vvorld vvas S. Antonies booke.

Creatures preach God: Psal. 99.

The vvorld an vniuersitie in vvhich a Godhead is taught.

The force of the first argument.

The vvorld is not by chaunce.

uer was of neceſsitie, neither can it be brought from ſomething to nothing, & ſo euer ſhal be, and that of neceſsitie. If it haue a neceſſarie & indedendent being, it hath an infinite eſſence, becauſe it is not limited by any, and ſo excedeth the bonds of a creature: & therfore if the world was of it ſelfe, it is a God: which perfection notwithſtanding it can not haue, becauſe the worlds material ſubſtance, mutabilitie, vi-ſibilitie, and determinate quantitie, argueth a creature, not a God, who is immaterial, inuiſible and infinite in his immenſitie. Who then was it that created this goodly palace and ſo huge a building as is this world? Not it ſelfe, as is proued, not any Angel, or other creature, be-cauſe creation of nothing argueth infinit power, and where is infinite power, there is an infinite eſſence, and ſo God only was he that could create it. And if thou wilt obſtinatly defend, that an Angel, or ſome other creature created it, I wil thus argue againſt thee. Either that creature which thou imagineſt to haue created the world, was of it ſelfe, or it was created of an other? If it was of it ſelfe, it was God, and ſo thou granteſt, which I endeuour to drowe from thee by force of ar-gumēt? if it was created of an other creature, I aſke who created that other, and ſo at the length I will leade thee to the firſt cauſe, which created al, and was created of none, which is the God whom we ſeeke for,

The world made not it ſelfe.

No Angel made it.

The ſecond argument. The litle world, man, prooueth a God.

4 Secondly not only the whole world but alſo euery part of it, wil make a plain remonſtrance of a Godhead. And to begin with man, who though he be a litle world, yet is but a part of the great world: who I pray you was it, that gaue the firſt man his being? We ſee by ex-perience that men breede not as flyes & wormes do of the corruption of other liuing creatures, neither do they ſpring out of the earth like herbes or toadſtooles, as Iulius Cæſar ſaid of the firſt inhabitants of England, neither are they begotten of beaſtes of any other kind, as mules are, but rather as we ſee by experience, man only begetteth man, and of no other liuing creature, no not of an Angel can he be begotten. Who then was it that gaue the firſt man his being? of him ſelfe man could not be, for then had he bene a God: of an other man he could not be begotten, beauſe no man could be before the firſt man, no other creature could beget him, as is already proued, *ergô* ſome thing that was no creature created him. And what is that but God?

5 An other part of the world, and that the moſt noble, is an Angel. And who I pray you created thoſe ſpirits and immaterial ſub-ſtances? one Angel could not beget an other, becauſe that would ar-

The creatiõ of Angels proueth a God.

gue them to be material substances, and corruptible creatures and no spirits. To say that men can produce Angels, or that any other creature extant could do the same, is farre lesse probable, because they are the higheſt creatures in perfection, and so could not be produced of their inferiors. It foloweth therfore that some cause not included vvithin the ranke of creatures created them: and what can that be but the Creatour. To deny al Angels and spirits, is against Philosophie, & al the best Philosophers. For Aristotle the Prince of Philosophers affirmeth, that the heauens are not moued by their owne proper formes & faculties, but by Angels, which he calleth intelligences. Plato and the Platonists make often mention both of good and euil Angels So doth Plutarch also, and diuers others, and who hath not read of Socrates familiar, which was called *demonium*, that is a good or euil spirit. Yea experience proueth that there are diuels, vvhich are spirits and differ only from the good Angels in malice. For if vve behold the strange effectes which are to be sene in possessed persons, we can not with any probabilitie ascribe al to a melancholike humour: for those pullings and conuulsions, strange motions and operations can not proceed from any humour or natural cause. For we see them some tymes lifted vp from the ground, some tymes they howle like dogges, some tymes they yel like wolues, sometymes they tel secrets, & speake in strange languages. The manifold & strange operations of witches, their meetinges and voyages which they make in the ayre, the strange apparitiõs, which al the world talketh of, and therfore can not lye, demonstrate that there are Angels and immaterial spirits. And seing these creatures can neither produce one an other, nor be produced of any create cause, we must nedes confesse a God and an increated spirit, who created them. The like proofe for a diuine povver the heauens do also yeld vs, for seing that no creature, nor second cause, could create those huge and incorruptible bodyes, vve must nedes confesse a God and first cause, vvho extended and framed them.

Angels proued.

l. 12. met. c. 70. 1. l. c. de cato c. 9.

In Plut. ad Tyrannum, & in Sympoſio Zenoc l. de morte Marusc. in Pymondro.

Diuels proued.

Read Martinus de Rio, and Springer.

The heauens proue a God.

The third argument, is order and diſpoſition.

The order of the 4. elements.

6 Thirdly the goodly order & disposition of things which we see, argueth a nature of intelligence not contained within the ranke of creatures which ruleth, guideth, and directeth al, and appointeth euerie creature his taske and place. We see how the elements are disposed of, and appointed euerie one to his natural place. The fire as most noble and of a most light and aspiring nature, taketh the highest place, the aire and water take the middle roome, because they participate of two extremes, the one agreeing with the fire in heat and ligth-

nes

es, the other with the earth in cold & heauines: and the earth being
of a heauy & lumpish nature, is vvorthilie thrust downe to the lowest
place. We see how the heauens and planets moue in order, and distin-
guish the times & seasons, neuer altering their course since they were
created, in so much that by their vniforme motion the Astrologers
can tel most certainly, the time yea minute of the change of the mone,
of the sunnes setting and rising, and of the sunnes & moones Eclipes.
We see the order & diuersitie of partes & members in planets, beasts,
and men, vvhich are so furnished of al parts and faculties belonging
vnto nature, that there is no part vvanting, none superfluous not so
much as a vaine, sinew, or litle bone, as we see by experience when
we want the least of them. The eyes are placed in the head, vvhich are
also made to turne about, that we may looke about vs, and therfore
are called the guides of the body. The eares are the organes of disci-
pline, because by them we heare what others say, vvithout the which
mans life were no life at al, for it should be deuoid of conuersation.
The nose smelleth a farre of al odours, vvhich are good or bad for the
bodies health, and besides it is the trumpet of the voice. The sence of
feeling is dispersed through out al partes of the body, whose office is
to feele vvhatsoeuer approcheth or toucheth the body, therby to flye
it, if it be hurtful, or to take commoditie of it, if it be conuenient. The
mouth receaueth the sustenance and meate, vvhich is necessarie for
the body, the tongue besides that it is the instrumeut of speaking, and
the interpreter of the mind, is to taste his meate and to iudge of it be-
fore it passe any farther, which iudgemēt being geuen, the throte swa-
loweth it downe. The stomake boyleth & disgesteth it, the liuer ma-
keth blood of it, the vaines conueigh this bloud to al partes of the bo-
dy, and nothing there is not necessarie or expediēt, not so much as the
guttes whose office as it is base, because they are as it were the sinkes
of the kitchin to passe the filth and excrementes, so are they so neces-
sarie, that otherwise the body would be poisoned and infected. Tel
me novv, ô godles Atheist, v vho it is that hath set dovvne this order?
vvho is he that so ruleth the motion of the heauens, that they moue at
the same tyme from East to west and backward againe, and one with-
in an other, and yet so, that they hinder not one an other? V vho hath
established a perpetual peace amongst the fowre elementes, vvhich
yet by reason of their contrarie qualities, are of a iarring nature. And
vvho hath so placed them as they may best agree? for the aire agreeth
vvith the fier in heat, and therfore is placed next vnto him: the vvater
in moy-

The orderly motion of the heauens.

The order of the parts of mans body.

The offices.

The disposition of al.

in moysture agreeth with the ayre, and in could vvith the earth, and therfore is lodged betvvixt them, vvheras if the vvater vvere placed next the fire, & the ayre next to the earth, they vvould make vvarre continually one vpon an other, and neuer vvould be satisfied vvithout the ruine of one an other, because they disagree in both qualities, the fire being hote and drye the vvater cold and moyst, the ayre hote and moyst and the earth cold and drye. Who hath so ordered the partes of the bodyes of liuing & mouing creatures as they may best serue their turnes, and by their proportion and disposition be the greatest ornament. Who sorteth al beasts vvith their kind, and placeth them in roomes fittest for their nature? some in the vvater, as fishes? some in the aire, as brids? some on the earth as beastes and plants? some in the fire, is there crekit and salamandre. Who setteth the plants & herbes, & giueth them a roote as a mouth to receiue their conuenient nurniture, and veines to conueigh it euen from the roote, to the highest bovves, yea leaues and frutes, and giue to euery one of them a seed, or some other thing in steed of seed, by vvhich they propagate themselues & retain a posteritie? vvho I pray thee, ô vngodly Impe (cõsidering this goodly order & disposition, vvho I pray thee beholding this goodly palace of God & men, in which is al this forniture, prouision, order, & disposition, wil not think of an artificer of intelligence, who builded it, and of a hovvs keper most vvise & prouident, vvho ruleth and disposeth of al in the same? Thou wilt say vvith Epicure, & such graceles, godles, & vvitles cõpanions, that al this goodly order happened by chance, and that by the like chance, this goodlye palace vvith al the partes and vvorkmanship therof, vvas framed and effectuated. By chance, sayest thou (o man) or rather no man, but some monster of mankind considerest thou vvel vvhat it is, vvhich thou auerrest to haue ben effectuated by chance? The printer shal neuer be able to set his print by casting his letters together at al aduẽtures. The painter by a careles casting of his colours vpon a cloth or table, shal neuer draw his intended picture. The mason by throwing of stones one at an other, shal neuer build his goodly palace. And canst thou thinke that al this goodly order, vvhich is set dovvne in the vvorld, at vvhich men and Angels stand astonished, vvas framed and established by chance medlie? If thou shouldest enter into a Westminster halle, a Non such, or Royalexchange in England, into a Louvver in Paris, or a Scurial in Spaine, where thou shouldst see statelie building, aspiring turrets, loftie roofes, vvittie conueighance of roomes, and chambers,

Amb. l. 5. Hexam. c. 8. Basil. ho. 5. in Hex.

Epicures opinion.

The vvorld vvas not by chance.

Examples.

ambers, and orderly disposition of windowes, pillers, chimnies? ouldest thou, or couldest thou imagin these artificial vvorkes and ldinges, to haue bene vvrought by a chancing flight of stones, the quarrie? & not rather by the art & skil of some ingenious arti- r, & canst thou entering into the sumptous building and palace of world, whose pauement is the earth, paued vvith so rich stones, netals & rushed with the greenes of al herbes & plants, whose fun- ion is the center which stayeth al, vvhose roose are the heauens, d so richely, with so many bright and glittering starres vvhose lles are the same heauens, vvhich do not only couer but also com- se al about, vvhose diuers roomes and lodgings are the sowre ele- nts, in which diuers creatures according to their diuers nature are erfly lodged, vvhose indweller & inhabitant is man, vvho vnder d also is Lord ouer al, vvhose prouisiõs & moueables are the goods fruite of the sea & land, layd vp in store for mans prouision: who y entering into this Princely palace, so vvel ordered, & gouerned, imagin al this to procede from chance, & not rather from an intel- nt artificer, vvho worketh these vvonders & miracles of nature, & ouident prince vvho gouerneth and ruleth al so vvisely, and like a t sitteth at the sterne, guiding and directing the course of this rld, & of euery creatures actiõs. For as Cicero that famous Orator Philosopher auoucheth, nothing is so open and so euident, vvhen looke vpon the heauens, and the celestial bodies, as that there ome Diuine power of most excellent vnderstanding, by vvhom se tings as they vvere first framed, so are they stil conserued and erned.

Description of the World.

l. 2. de natura deorum.

The fourth argumens taken from brute beasts, so ingenious operations.

Fourthly against these vvitles Atheistes, the very brute beastes argue for their Creatour, vvhose operations are so vvitty and a- ble to the end, which is to them by God and nature prescribed, they had discours, and were indewed with reason. They feare tho- hings which are contrarie to their good, and distinguish the good n bad, as if they had the science of good and bad. The shepe, yea the ng lamb, euen at the first, discerneth the vvoolfe from the dogge, quaketh at the very sight of him, although he differeth litle from dogge, vvhich he feareth not. The chicken can put a difference vixt the kite and te Peacocke, and feareth one, litle caring for the r although in body bigget The smal byrdes feare the sparhauke, duck the faucon, and do tremble at the very noise of their belles et they care not for the swanne, nor crane, though in body much bigger.

Sheep feare the vvoolfe.

Chickins the kite.

Smal birdes the hauke.

bigger. Vvho teacheth them thus to discerne their enemies, vvho putteth in thē such a feare of that, which in dede is to be feared? Thou vvilt say, the instinct of nature, but vvho put such an instinct in nature by vvhich they fly their foes, as if they had reason, but he that is the author of nature & reason? Vvho teacheth brute beastes, in a medow or garden, vvhere there are so many herbs one like an other, to choose the good, and to refuse the bad, and so coningly, as if they vvere Phisitiās, or herbistes, & knew the nature of simples: in so much that where as men, many tymes are poisonned in taking one drug, or herbe for an other; such an error neuer hapneth amongest them. Vve see how artificially byrdes do build their nestes, vvherin they make such a defence against the vvether, that no mason can correct their vvorke. The spider spinneth the threde out of his ovvne substance, which aftervvard he vveaueth so artificially, that he maketh a formal net which also he putteth in those places, vvhere flyes are likest to passe. And he like a byrdcatcher, lyeth lurking in a corner of the same, without any motion: but no sooner doth the fly touch his nette, but he vvith al spede maketh hast vnto it. I haue already described the trauel of the Antes in making their haruest, and carying in their corne, and how they eate the end of it, lest it grovv in the earth, and bring it forth to drying in a sunny day, lest moysture corrupt it. And I haue in part described the cōmon welth of bees, which is so wel ordered, that a christiā & cōmon welth man may lerne policie & gouernement of them. The hare vvhat slight vseth she to eschape the houndes, how many bypapes maketh she, how many bywayes taketh she, and if she come near a vvater she wil passe it, if nere a heard of catel, she entreth amōgst them to deceue the houndes, and to make them loose the sent. How subtil and craftie the Foxe is, I report me to huntsmen: and what deuises he vseth to attain to his pray, few there are which know not. On a tyme (as a man of credit told me vvho was an eye vvitnes) the Foxe espying ducks in a riuer, deuised this stratagem to deceue them: he taketh a bush of ferne, which he caryeth in his mouth to the water, and putteth it into the water, farre aboue them, lest he should be espyed, and about the streame also, that it might descend dovvne vnto thē, and passe amōgst thorovv them: and this he did tvvise, or thrise. The duckes suspecting nothing, let the ferne passe by them: at the length the foxe himself cometh svviming down the streame, with a ferne bush in his mouth, and that so couertly, that nothing appeared aboue the vvater, but the bush: the duckes suspecting no more deceit, then was before, & imag-

Beasts seme to be herbistes.

The artificial building of birdes.

The Spiders vveauing.

In the seuēth booke. chap. 15.

The prouision of Antes and bees.

The slight of the hare.

The crafte of the foxe.

ng that it was but a ferne bush which came down ne the streame, fled
t for the matter, because they feared nothing: but when the Fox
me amongst them, he shewed him selfe to be a fox, for leauing the
sh, he snatcheth at a ducke, & changeth his bush for the same. Hen-
I deduce this argument: These creatures are witles & deuoid of re- *The force of*
on, and yet do they procede in their actions most wittily and reaso- *this argumẽt.*
bly, as if they had discours & reason, & some tymes they shew more
itte in their actions, then do men them selues, who are reasonable
d discoursing creatures. And seing that so orderly and so reasonable
tions, can not procede from any reason, vvhich is in them, because
ey are vnreasonable, I do inferre that there is some one of reason
oue al these creatures, who thus directeth and gouerneth their actio-
s. Neither wil it suffice to say, that they do al this by the instinct
nature, which is nothing else but a natural inclination: because
ng that this natural instinct is not reason, and yet directeth them
reasonably, it must nedes procede from one of reason, who could
print in them such an inclination, which being not reason, doth
rect them notwithstãding, and gouern them in their actions, as if
ey had reason. Vvherfore as vvhen thou seest the arrovv fly directly *A fit exam-*
the marke, thou streight vvayes imaginest an Archer, though thou *ple and simi-*
est him not, because so direct a motion, could not procede from the *litude.*
ovv, had not the Archer, vvho is indevved vvith reason, giuen
his direction, and imprinted in it a force also, vvhich carrieth it dire-
ly to the marcke, at which he aymed: so whẽ thou seest vnreasonable
eatures to procede in their actions so vvittily, and so orderly, thou
ust thinke of some one of intelligence, vvho hath imprinted in them
atural instinct vvhich directeth them in their actions, as if they had
ason.

5 Fifthly, what soeuer is in this world, either it is of it selfe, or of *The fifth ar-*
other. If of it selfe, then is it God, because, as before is proued, *gument is de-*
be independent, is to haue a necessarie & infinite essence, vvhich *pendance of al*
no other thing then God. If it be of an other, I aske againe of whom *creatures of*
pendeth that other: & so at length I wil bring thee to a thing, of *one Independ-*
vhich al thinges are depending & that is depending of none: which *dent.*
the God we seeke for. To this argument may be reduced that argu-
ent of Aristotle by vvhich he proueth the first Moouer, vvhich S.
homas also vseth. VVhat soeuer (sayth Aristotle) is moued, is moued 1. p. q. 2. 63.
an other. The inferiour creatures are moued by the heauens, and l. 2. met.
eir influẽces, which reach euen to the bovvelles of the earth, vvhere

by vertue of them, gold & siluer are engendred, the inferior heauens are moued by the first heauen, which is *primum mobile*, because the other heauens folow the sway of that. The first heauen then ether it moueth it selfe, or it is moued of an other? it can not move selfe, because it is a creature, and so as in essence and being, so in motion & operatiō, it dependeth of an other: If it be moued of an other then I demand, whether that moueth of it selfe, or by the motion of an other? if you say of an other, I aske againe whether that is moued by it selfe, or by an other, And so ether we must ascend in infinitum (which is impossible) because an infinite distance can neuer be passed and so the inferiour cause which receiueth vertue from the superiour should neuer be able to moue, because it should expect an infinite tyme, to receiue motion from a superiour cause, whose motion must passe through infinite inferior causes, before it come to the lowest, or else at length we must stay in a supreme cause, which moueth all, & it selfe is moued of none. And what is that but God.

the first mouer proued

Vide Greg. de Valentia, Gabriclem Vasques. 1. p. q. 2. Nolmia ibidem.

6. Sixtly I wil bring a moral argument, which also conuinceth the veritie. It is the opinion euen of the Paganes, to which the light of reason hath induced them, that there is vice and vertue in our actions and that the one deserueth punishment, the other reward, as in the last booke is related: and seing that in this life, nether vice hath her dew punishement (because the vicious liue in prosperitie and enioy most commonly the felicitie of this life in more ample maner then the vertuous) nor vertue her reward, because the vertous are mispraised, it foloweth that there is an other life, in vvhich God, vvho hath an equal prouidence ouer al, shal giue to euerie action his iust and dew reward.

The Sixt argument taken from the reward of vertue.

Supra.

7 Seuenthly (as Cicero sayth) neuer any nation vvas so barbarous, whom the light of reason, indewed vvith an opinion of God or Gods, yea euen the Atheistes them selues, if they fal into any extremitie, are forced by nature to cry and cal vpon a God. For if a man by shipwrake were in danger of drovvning, then so long as he seeth humaine meanes to saue him, he vvil snatch at a cord that is cast vnto him, or he vvil reach for a borde, or seeke to get hold of a boate, rocke or tree, to helpe him selfe by, and if he be an Atheist, then so long as these meanes faile not, he seeketh for no other, but if he perceue, that by no creatures he can be holpen, then be he Christian or Pagane, Ievv or Atheist, he thinketh vpon some higher powver, and vvhen all creatures forsake him, and his owne force wil no more serue him, no

The seuenth argument is taken from the common opinion euen, of Atheists in extreantie.

re biddeth him to seeke farther, & to demand that helpe of the Cre-
tour, vvhich no creature can yeeld him.

8 Lastly the greatest sinners that are, vvho vvould vvith al their
artes that there vvere no God, that they might sinne the more freely,
n the middest of their vices, & pleasures haue many tymes remorses of
onscience, and feare euen naturally, by natures instinct and instru-
tion, some diuine power, that vvil cal thē to an account. Hence pro-
ede their melancholike moodes by day, & fearful dreames by night,
s in the former booke, & in the chapter of conscience may appeare.
nd truly we see that nothing hath so much force in the rule of mens
ctions, and direction of their life, as the cogitation of a Diuine Maie-
ie, to vvhom they must yeeld and render a strict account. For thus
ome tymes the greatest sinners are enforced to discourse. I let the
ridle loose to al vice and pleasure, I bridle no passions, I refraine from
iustice, vvhen by iniuring others I can profit my selfe: I liue accor-
ing as I wil, & as freely as he that hath no master, & if there vvere no
Diuinitie, to vvhom I am to yeeld an account for euery action, I
ight take my hartes ease amidst al my pleasures: but if there be a God,
s I feare there is, & as me thinke there is (for else why doth this cogi-
ation of a Diuinitie so often crosse the vvays of my pleasures) then
aue I cause to looke to my actions, and to make my account before
and, lest I be taken in the lurch. But vvhat if there be no God, then
ad I lesse cause to care. But because peraduēture there is a God, in the
iddest of my pleasure I haue not my hartes desire, and ful repose.
Many other argmentes I could alleage for Diuine power, but these
re the principal. who desireth more, let him read S. Thomas in his
Theological Summe, & in his worke which he wrot against the
Gentiles, as also Granado in the beginning of his Catechisme, and the
English Resolution or Directorie: and he shal find that al say the same
in substance. Now let vs draw nerer to our cōclusion, & intended pur-
pose: which is to shew hovv our reformers doctrin leadeth vs vnto
he denial of a Godhead. VVhich I wil do briefly and yet so plainly, as
he reader shal confesse, that to haue vsed mo vvordes in a matter so
plaine, had bene prolixitie and superfluitie. If you remember, they are
ot afraid to auouch that God is the author of al sinne and wicked-
es, that he hath ordained vs to sinne from al eternitie, that vve sinne
ot only by his permission, but also by his wil & cōmandement, yea
hat he vrgeth vs and compelleth vs to sinne: vvhence it folovveth
hat he is of a malicious nature, bent to al euil, because so bad frutes

The 8. argument is take from the remorse of conscience.

A sinners discourse.

See also Greg de Valentia & Vasquez. 1. p. q 2. Molinia ibidem.

See the fifth booke. chap. 4.

can not procede from a good tree: he cõmandeth vs alſo vnder payne of damnation to refraine from al ſinne & vice, which notwithſtãding by the reformers doctrin we can not do, becauſe we haue no freez wil: & if vve ſinne and dye in ſinne, he puniſheth vs vvith a perpetual & helliſhfire, for that fault vvhich vve could not auoid, and in which he him ſelf had as much part as we our ſelues: whence it folovveth that he is not only malicious, but cruel alſo & tyrannical, as vpon an other occaſion, is before demonſtrated. If therfore a Chriſtian be once perſwaded that this doctrin is true, he wil eaſily be induced, to thinke as Atheiſtes do, that there is no God at al. For ſeing that the common conceit of God hitherto hath bene very hononrable, euery one deeming that which is moſt perfect, beſt, and moſt amiable, to be God: men wil more eaſilie be perſwaded with Diagoras andd Protagoras, that there is no God at al, then that he is of ſo bad, cruel, and malicious a nature.

See the 5. booke. chap. 3. 4.

The concluſion.

The ſecond Chapter shevveth hovv the newu religion by the ſame doctrin ruineth religion and vvorship of God.

Religion followeth knovvledge of God.

RELIGION is a moral vertue, and one of the principal vertues of that kind, whoſe office is to offer vnto God ſupreme honour, homage, and worſhip, as vnto the higheſt: vvhich although ſhe haue not the Diuinitie for her immediate obiect, as the Theological vertues haue, yet cometh ſhe as nere as may be, becauſe ſhe hath the worſhip of this Diuinitie for her obiect, and attendeth vpon the diuinitie ſo faithfully, that no ſooner is a God acknowledged, but Religion adoreth him, and yeldeth him his homage for a tribute.

Religion vvas euer.

2. Wherfore euer ſince there vvas a reaſonable creature, able to knovv God, the vvorld vvas neuer vvithout Religion. In Paradiſe our firſt parentes vvorſhipped a God for the tyme, and if that ſtate had continued, there ſhould haue bene a publike practiſe of Religion, and by Sacrifice alſo, as ſome diuines teach. And vvhat vvorſhip of God by Sacrifices, and Sacramentes vvas vſed in the lavv of nature, and of

Suarez 3. p. de ſacrificio Miſſæ.

Moyſes

Moyſes I haue already declared. Yea neuer as yet vvas there any nation, vvho acknowledged a Diuinitie, but it alſo vvorſhipped the ſame with ſome kind of Religion. For men eaſily perceiued, that to Maieſtie, povver, and excellencie, honour vvas a dew tribute, and by good conſequence, that to ſupreme Maieſtie, power and excellencie, vvas dew alſo ſupreme homage and religion. Which is the cauſe, as Liuie reporteth, that Rome vvas no ſooner built, but a religion alſo vvas eſtabliſhed, and temples dedicated vnto the Gods. For vvhich deuotion, Valerius Maximus commendeth the Romaines, ſaying, that they thought nothing vvas to be peferred before religion, but that rather as the Gods vvere eſtemed aboue their Senators, Dictators, and Emperours, ſo religion ſhould take place before their ciuil lawes and cuſtomes. Of vvhich opinion Plato alſo ſheweth him ſelfe to haue bene, vvho in his vvorke vvhich he made of lawes, decreed ſome for gouernment and policie, others for religion, and theſe he counted the principal and fundamental lawes: vvel knovving that to be true, which Cicero after him obſerued, that if once pietie and religion tovvards God, be taken a way, fidelitie and iuſtice amongſt men, can not long continevv. And Plutarch affirmeth that you ſhal ſooner find a citie vvithout coyne, walles, lawes, and lernig, then without temples and vvorſhip of Gods. And although this religion of the paganes, vvas no religion but ſuperſtition, yet this ſuperſtition proceded by abuſe, from a natural inclination, vvhich man hath to vvorſhip & honour a God. Becauſe ſuperſtition and religion do only differ in this, that ſuperſtition ether worſhippeth a falſe God, or at leaſt gineth not a right honour vnto the true God, but religion worſhippeth the true God, & not whith a vaine & phantaſtical, but with a true, ſincere, & reaſonable worſhip. So that mā by nature is inclined to religiō, only he faileth ether in the thing which is to be worſhipped, or in the maner of worhip, & therfore if a man be of any diſcourſe able to know, that there is a God, you ſhal not nede to perſuade him that God is to be worſhipped, only in this he ſhal nede your help, vvhat is this God, & with what worſhip & religion he is to be ſerued. And herein cōſiſteth the principal point of the cōtrouerſie which to this day euen frō the beginning, hath trubled the world, and the greateſt vvittes of the vvorld, to vvit, with vvhat vvorſhip and religion God is to be ſerued for although al almoſt agree in this, that God is religiouſly to be honoured & reſpected, as the diuerſitie of religions vvhich poſſeſſe the vvorld, wil teſtifie. Yet in the other point, to vvit, vvith vvhat religion

ſupra. l. 1. & b & l. 9. c. 2 & 6.

l. 1.

l. 1. c. 1.

l. 4.

l. 1. de natura deorum. Aduerſus Colotem.

How ſuperſtition and religion differ.

The controuerſie which troubleth the vvorld.

religion he is to be reuerenced, men are as diuerse, as there are diuers religions in the vvorld.

3. Wherfore here might I take occasion to refute the religion of the Iewes, Turkes, Paganes, and old Heretiques by many argumentes, and by as many argumentes I could demonstrate the Catholique and Romaine faith and worship of God, to be the only true religion, which I haue done in my commentaries vpon Secunda Secundæ: but this were a thing to long, and besides my purpose, vvhich vvas only to make a general surucy and examination of the nevv religion. Wherfore I leaue that to others, and peraduenture to some other booke, vvich, if this bevvel accepted, I may herafter set forth: only here, in a world or tvvo, I wil direct the reader to certaine places of this Surucy, in which vpon occasion I haue disproued the nevv religion, and

l. 1. established the old, by pregnant reasons. For first of al my first booke demonstrateth that vve can not admit nether the Reformers nor their religion, for good and lavvful, vnles vve bynd our selues by the same reason to receiue al heretikes and heresies that euer vvere hertofore, or shalbe herafter: yea in the fifth chapter of the sayd booke I haue proued the Catholicque Religion to be the only religion, because it is conformable to that vvhich was so strangely planted by the Apostles, and in the same place I haue proued manifestly that the reformers haue no probable meanes or motiues to induce a reasonable man to be of their profession. In the second booke I haue declared how the markes of heretikes agree vnto them, & that therfore they must be taken for heretikes, & their doctrin for heresie, if Arianisme or any other such like doctrin be iustly so to be censured. In the third booke I declare hovv their doctrin disgraceth Christ, and so can not be Christian religion, & in the bookes folovving I shevv how it repugneth to ciuile state and policie, hovv iniurious it is to God, how it openeth the gap vnto al vice and Atheisme, and so can not be of God. Yea in the fourth booke I proue that they haue no religion, because they haue no Priestes nor Sacrifices, nor prayer, & scarsely any Sacramentes, notvvithanding that these things & religion euer vvent together. Secondly in the alleaged fifth chapter I haue compared our ancient Pastors of vvhom vve receiued our Religon vvith their nevv ministers of vvhom they receiued theirs, and I haue proued that our Pastors in al pointes are to be preferred, & consequently our religion. Thirdly in the second booke and fifth Chapter, I proue that once Christian religion was planted in the world, & Pastors were appointed. I

Proofes of the catholique, and disproofes, of the nevv religion.

l. 2.

l. 3.

l. 4.

l. 1. c. 5.

l. 2. c. 5.

ted, I haue proued also that this Religion and succession of Pastors are neuer to be changed, & consequently, that is the true Church & Religion, vvhich can deriue it selfe by a continual succession from the first Pastors & the first faith that was planted and practised. I haue proued also that the reformers haue not this succession, and that Catholiques haue: whence it foloweth euidently, that their religion is not the true Christian religion, and that ours is the true and only Religion. In the Sixth Chapter I proue that in Christs Church and religion is peace & vnitie in faith and doctrin, which Christ at his departure bequeathed to his Chruth, and I haue demonstrated that his peace and vnitie is not to be found amongst the reformers, but only amongst Catholiques, and consequently that the Catholique Religion is the only Christian Religion. In the Seuenth chapter I proue that the Religion of true Christians is no particular sect, but Catholique and vniuersal, and one & the same in al countries and ages, & seing that only the Catholique Religion hath this propertie, it foloweth that that is the true Christian Religion. So that I shal not nede to vse any other argument, to proue that the Catholique Religion only is the true Religion and worship of God.

l. 2. c. 6.

l. 2. c. 7.

4 It remaineth therfore only, that I now declare how the reformers open the gappe to a certaine kind of Atheisme, which is irreligiositie & contempt of al religion, & because this conclusion is often tymes to be inferred out of other pointes of their doctrin in the Chapters folowing, I content my selfe in this Chapter with their doctrin alleaged in the former Chapter, and out of that only I wil deduce my intended conclusion, which I may do with as much breuitie as facilitie. For if God be the author of al sinne, then if we may gather what the tree is by the frute, he is of a malicious nature as is before proued: and if he command vs impossibilities and punish vs with hel fyer for not fulfilling them, then is he vnreasonable, cruel, and barbarous. And if we once make this conceit of God (as we must nedes if we beleue the aduersaries opinion) then must our harts of necessitie be cold in Religiō, & worship of God. For who can be induced to worship, loue, & honour such a God, in whom is nothing that is amible, nothing worthy honour, wel we may feare him for his cruelrie, but loue him, and honour him from the hart we can nor. And so Religion falleth.

How the Reformers bring in contempt of Religion.

Calvin saith so as is related aboue in the 5. booke chap. 1. See the same booke chap. 4.

The third Chapter shevveth that in contempt of the Churches authoritie they bring al religion in contempt.

Cal. l. 4. Inst. c. 2. Monsieur du Plessis en son traicte de l'Eglise. See the second booke & first chap.

THis is a Maxime and almost an article of faith receiued amongst the reformers, that the true Church which once vvas, hath erred grossely, & in no lesser matters then faith, iustification, purgatorie, prayer to Saincts, worship of images, number and vertue of Sacraments, Sacrifice, and such like. Yea they confesse that the Romain Church vvas once the true Church, but they adde vvithal that afterwardes it erred, and fel, & novv of the Church of Christ is become the Synagogue of the diuel. This is the cause vvhy vvhen vve vrge the authoritie of the ancient and present Church, for the proofe of pointes of Religion they answer vs that the Church, was but a congregation of men, which hath erred in manie things. And therfore Luther careth not for a thousand Churches, & Caluin, Beza, & others despise al the Coūcels, & anciēt Fathers, as appeareth by their wordes which are related in the first booke, and the third, & fourth chapters. So that vpon the bare authoritie of the Church they wil not hang their soules: because the Church as it may be deceiued, say they so it may deceiue. But I demand of them vvhat assurance they haue of Scripture, and by vvhat meanes they come to the knovvledge of it.

See the first booke chap. 3. 4.

What a Catholique can say for Scripture.

2. Tim. 3. Io. 14. 15. l. cont epist. fund. c. 5. See aboue booke 1. chap. l. 2. c. 24. 4. l. præfa. de expos. Symb. l. 2 c 4. 5. 46. l. 4. c. 11.

2 A Catholique vvould say that he beleueth these bookes to be the word of God, because the Catholique Church, vvhich is the pillar of truth, to vvhich by the Sonne of God was promised *a spirit vvhich should teach her al veritie*, hath euer so beleued & defined. Vvherfore S. Austin sayth, that he vvould *not beleue the Gospel vnles the Churches authoritie moued him*: not that the Church maketh Scriptures, or giueth them their truth and veritie (for that they haue of God vvho vvas the inditer of them) but because vve can not knovv vvhich is Scripture, vvhich is not, but by the voice of the Church, to vvhich only in this matter the ancient Fathers were vvont to harken, as Ireneus, Tertullian, S. Hierom, S. Leo the first, and diuers others, of vvhom Nicephorus maketh mention. Wherfore the first Toletan Councel, in the

one

one and tvventith canon, accurseth them vvho accept of any other Scriptures then those vvhich the Catholique Church receiueth. He vvould alleage for an argument that Christ made Peter, & his successour the Pope, supreme pastor of the Church, and commanded him to *feed his shepe*: and seing that a principal office of the shepheard, is to shew them such pastures as are most holsome for them: it perteineth to the supreme Pastors of the Church, to tel vs infallibly, vvhich are the true Scriptures: for when he declareth vvhich are the true Scripturs, he shevveth vs our pasture, & the place wher vve are to graze, and vvhen he expounderth them, he feederth vs. And seing that the Pope of Rome is this Pastor (as is proued in the sixth chapter of the first booke) it folovveth that we must receiue that for Scripture which he alovveth of as Scripture. He vvould alleage also the antiquitie of Scriptures for a prose of their sinceritie: becaus Moyses vvho vvas the vvriter of a great part of the old testament (as Iosephus, Tertullian, and Eusebius affirme) by many hundred yeares, vvas more ancient then al the vvriters of the Romains and Grecians also, vvhich therfore deserue great credit and reuerence, becaus, as Cicero sayth in his Tusculans questions, to Antiquitie no lesse is devv. He vvould confirme this argument by an other of no lesse efficacie, to vvit, that these bookes haue bene conserued so many thousand yeares, notvvithstanding so many captiuities of the Iewes, and persecutions of the Christians, vvhich argueth that God who vvas the Author of them, had a special care of them, and a vigilant eye vnto them, as vnto his ovvne vvord and vvriting. He might alleage also the conformitie of these bookes, vvhich vvere indigted of diuers, & at diuers tymes, and yet haue in them no contrarieties, and vvere translated out of Hebrevv into Greke by 72 Interpreters, diuersly disposed, vvho yet notvvithstanding so agreed, as if al their translations had bene copied out of one. For vvhich causes euen the Gentils and Pagans them selues, haue borne great respect vnto these vvritings, not daring to mingle them vvith their prophane vvritinges, becaus (as Iosephus and Eusebius affirme) some that haue attempted it, by the diuine and secret povver, haue bene sharpely and seuerly punished: al vvhich is vvaranted by historie and tradition. This a Catholique may say vvith great confidenc and no lesse probabilitie, for the authoritie of holy Scripture.

Io. 21.

S. Peters successour telleth vvhich is Scripture.

Antiquitie of Scripture.

l. 2. cont. Ap.

l. 19 præpar. Euangelic.

Apolog. c. 19. 20. 24.

1. Tusc.

The strange conseruation of Scripture.

Conformitie of Script.

Iustin. orat. parænad genter.

l. 18. Ant. c. 1. præpar. c. 1.

3 But what vvould, or what could, our reformers say? vvould they say with the Catholique, that they beleue them to be holy Scripture,

ex Hosio. l. 3. cont. Brent.

ture, because the Church sayth so? Luther in dede sayth that he in this point beleueth the Church and Pope, & good reason hath he: because of whom did he receiue the Scriptures when he began first to preach his new doctrin, but of the Romain Church, who euer had the custodie of them, euen since the time of the Apostles? And how could he know that the Gospel of the Nazarens, of S Barnabas, & S. Thomas, were not as true Scripture as the Gospel of S. Matthevv, and other Euangelistes, but that the Romain Church alowed of these, and not of those? For this cause some of them do say, that in this point they must nedes beleue the Pope, and Romain Church, because they can not in dede haue any probable knowledge of Scripture, but by this meanes, as shal appeare by the refutation of al other meanes vvhich they can faine or imagin. But I wil be so bold as to take this meanes from them, and then I wil aske them, how they know that the new and old Testament are not mere fables, and fictions, as the Atheistes say that they are? For they are of opinion, that the Romain Church may deceiue, and be deceiued, and therfore they wil not beleue her for the number of canonical bookes, nor for the meaning of Scripture; how then can they credit her vvhen she defineth that the old and new testament are holy Scripture: their authoritie is one & the same in the affirmation of this, and of other thinges: if then they beleue her not in those things, they can not beleue her in this. For as if the Astrologer say that to morow shal be rayne, and vvithin three monethes there shal be rayne, I can not beleue this to be true, for his assertion, vnlesse I also beleue that, because his authoritie is the same: and yet may I beleue rather that within three monethes & we shal haue raine, then that to morow we shal haue rayne, because that in it selfe is more likely: so if we beleue one thing vvhich the Romain Church affirmeth, & not an other, we beleue not any thing because she sayth so, but either for the probabilitie of the thing, or for some other reason vvhich pleaseth vs. Wherfore seing that our reformers beleue not the Romain Church in al pointes, it must needes folow, that they can not beleue that the old & new Testament are holy Scriptures, because she sayth so, but for some other imaginations, which they haue: for if they beleued this because she sayth so, they would beleue other things also which she auoucheth, because her authoritie being the same, deserueth the same credit in the one, and in the other. But let vs suppose that they beleue that the old & new testament are holy Scripture because the Romain Chusch sayth so, yet because they affirme that the

Eusseb. l. 1. c. 25.

Supra. Calu. l. 4. inst c. 1. 2.

Heretiques can not credit the Romain church for Scriptures.

Romain

Romain Church may lye, and hath also lyed loudly in many impor- Supra.
tant matters: it foloweth that they haue hereby no assurãce of Script
ure, because as the Church, in their opinion, hath erred in othe, *by the Romain church heretikes can haue no assurance of Scripture.*
things, so may she in this, and if she may, peraduenture she hath erred
and so they haue no assurance of Scripture.

4. They wil say peraduenture that they are assured by tradition *tradition can not help them.*
from tyme out of mynde vnto this present, that those bookes are
holy Scripture, because our forfathers euer esteemed them so. But
neither can this be a sufficient vvarrant, because they are vvont to
say, that al thinges necessarie to be beleued, are conteined in scripture,
and that therfore they wil beleue no tradition. And if they beleue that
these bookes are holy scripture, because by tradition so it is deliuered
vnto them, vvhy do they not beleue the real presence, & the Sacrifice
of the Masse? Vvhy contemne they, the Fast of Lent, Images, holy
vvater, the signe of the Crosse, and such like, vvhich we haue by the
same tradition, by vvhich we haue the Scriptures. Yea seing that Tra-
dition is nothing else but an opinion or custom of the Church, not
vvritten in holy writte, but yet deliuered by the handes of the Church
from tyme to time, and from Christians to Christians, euen vnto
the last age; if the Church can erre, she may allow of euil tradi-
tions, and so traditions also may be erroneous, and consequently can
be no sufficient vvarrant vnto the Reformers, for the authoritie of
holy Scripture. They wil say peraduenture, that they beleue most *Most voices helpe them not.*
voices, and therfore seing that al the vvorld allovveth these bookes
for holy Scripture, they wil ioine with them in this opinion, because
the voice of the people, is the voice of God. But neither can this voice
assure them. For either they vnderstand by this common voice, the
voice of the vvhole world, or the voice of the Christian vvorld. If
they meane the voice of the vvhole vvorld, then haue they no voices *See the 2. booke chap. 7.*
against them, then for thẽ, because the greatest part of the world was
euer Pagan: if they meane the Christian world, then in dede the most
voices are for Scripture, because the Catholique Church, vvhich
foloweth of Scripture, vvas, is, & shalbe the greatest part of Christia-
nitie, but because they say that this Church may erre, they can haue *Heretikes haue no assurance by their owne church.*
no assurance of Scripture by this voice.

5. Yet they wil say perhaps that they beleeue that Scripture is
the vvord of God, because their ovvne Church, vvhich is the true
Church, affirmeth it to be so. But niether vvil this shift serue their
turne. For first of al they can not proue their Church to be the true

Church nor their Pastors to be the true Pastors. Because their Church hath not the markes of the true Church, hauing neither succession from the Church planted by the Apostles, vvhich should make it Apostolique, neither hauing euer possessed the greatest part of the knovvne vvorld, vvhich should make it Catholique, and being so farre from being one, that it is diuided into cõtrarie sectes, & so farre also from being holy, that it leadeth to al vice & Atheisme, yea hauing al the markes of heresie, as my second booke demonstrateth. As for their Pastors, they can not proue their mission, as also is proued. But if I should grant that their Church is the true Church, yet by their Churches warrant, they can haue no assurance of Scripture, because they are of opinion that the true Church may erre, and cõsequently their Church also may erre, and if it may erre in other thinges, it may erre in this, & if it may erre in this, peraduẽture it hath erred in this, and so they haue no assurance of Scripture. Wherfore laying aside the Churches authoritie as insufficient in their opinion, I demand vvhat assurance they haue of Scripture?

in the first booke. chap. 1.

Scripture can giue no testimonie of her selfe.

6. They can not alleage Scipture to proue scripture, because no part of Scripture affirmeth that the Bookes called Scripture, are the word of God, dictated & indighted by his holy Spirit. And if Scripture did affirme it selfe to be holy Scripture, yet were not that a sufficient warrant, for as I may doubt whether the bookes called Scripture be the vvord of God, so may I doubt of that testimonie vvhich Scripture geueth of her selfe, vnles by some other meanes I be assured, that these writings are the word of God. They wil say peraduẽture that the very maiestie of the phrase of Scripture, and the diuine matters and mysteries which it conteineth do argue, that it is the word of God. But this answer is also insufficient, because to a worldly man or prophane Philosopher, the stile of Scripture semeth base & barbarous, and the mysteries seeme to be nothing els but dreames and imaginations, the histories seeme tales, & the matters seeme either follies or impossibilities, and so they would seeme vnto vs also, vvere it not that we haue a reuerent conceite of them, because we beleue them to be the word of God. Vvherfore Iulian the Apostata. Celsus, Porphirius, Apion, and others, contemned Scripture, both for the phrase and matter, and estemed no more of them, then we do of Æsops fables.

Phrase of Scrip no argument.

7 They may answer me peraduẽture (& now I know not what else they can answer) that the spirit assureth them that these bookes and no other, are the holy Scripture. But against this spirit, I haue dis-

puted

uted at large in the first booke and third chapter, and so I might re- *The spirit is*
erre the reformer, and the reader vnto my arguments, vvherevvith *no assurance*
n the aforesayd place, I haue refuted this phantastical spirit. Yea to *l. 1. c. 3.*
ase them both of that labour, I wil in a word reiect this answer, by
iecting this spirit. I vvil aske of him that thinketh him selfe most
eeply inspired, why he beleueth this his owne priuate spirit, rather
hen the common spirit of the Church? Especially seing that it is more
ke that God vvil more amply communicate his Spirit to his Church
hen to a priuate man, & if the Church may be deceiued (as they say
e may) notwithstanding that Christ promised her a *spirit vvhich should*
ach her al veritie, vvhy may not euery priuate man doubt at least, lest *Io. 14. 15.*
is ovvne priuate spirit be a lying and deceiuing spirit. He answereth
at his spirit assureth him, that it is a true spirit. But how doth it assure
im, by vvhat reasons, miracles, or reuelations, by no such meanes
aith he) it doth assure me, but yet I am sure. Vvhy art thou sure, if
ether for reasons, nor miracles, nor reuelations, then art thou sure
nly because thou thinkest thy selfe sure. And so did Suenkfeldius
hinke him selfe sure of a right spirit, when he denyed al Scriptures, &
vould be ruled only by the invvard spirit, & yet he for al his surenes,
as deceiued, & consequently so mayst thou be, though thou thinkest
y selfe assured. And do not al heretikes thinke them selues to be in-
ired vvith the right spirit? As they therfore are deceiued, so mayst
ou be, vnles thou haue some certaine rule and iudge, such as the
hurch is, to acertain thee of thy spirit. If now some Infidel or Atheist
vould deny the old and nevv testament to be holy Scripture, hovv
vouldst thou conuince them? vvhat a Catholique could say for the
roofe of Scripture, I haue allready declared. I demand therfore
hat thou who takest vpon thee to be a reformed Christian, couldest
leage for the authoritie of Scripture?

8. Wouldst thou alleage the Churches definition or tradition, or *The Reformers can not proue scripture against painims.*
mon cosent? he vvould say, tush, tel me not of Church, Tradition,
athers, Counccls, al these by your ovvne confession may erre and
ue erred in other as great matters as this, & therfore this can be no
fficient warrant. Vvouldst thou say that Scripture giueth testimony
her selfe that she is Scripture; he would aske thee vvhere, and thou
ouldst not be able, to quote the place, and if thou couldst, yet he
hould say that Scripture is not to be beleued in her owne cause, and
at as he doubteth of Scripture, so he doubteth, vvhether it be Scrip-
re, which affirmeth these bookes to be Scripture. Wouldst thou say

that

that the phrase of Scripture argueth it to be Gods owne word? He would tel thee that he wil shew thee as good phrases in Tullie, Liuie, and other prophane writers. And if thou shouldest say that thy spirit assureth thee, that these bookes are of Gods owne indighting, he would laugh at thee, and tel thee, that Suenkfeldius by his spirit denyed al Scripture, and that he hath no more assurance of thy spirit then thou hast of his. Yea he wil come vpon thee with the common spirit of the Romain Church, & tel thee, that if that spirit may deceiue, as thou sayst it may, much more may thy priuate spirit deceiue thee, & al the wil be so mad as to beleue thee. And so if thou cõtemne the authoritie of the Romain Church, thou shalt be able to assure him no more of Scripture, then of a Robin Hoods tale.

9. If the Churches authoritie then be reiected as insufficient, we haue no probable assurance of Scripture, & so we may iustly doubt left it be but some Apocriphal writing, which hath hetherto bene called the word of God, to keepe fooles in awe. And if we may doubt of the bookes of Scipture, we may as iustly doubt of the contentes, & so the mysteries of the Trinitie, & Incarnation, Christs life, Doctrin, Passion, Death and Resurrection, may be called in question, & so Christian religion falleth; and seing that after an Apostasie from Christianitie, we haue no reason to imbrace Turcisme, or the Iudaical ceremonies, much lesse the superstitions of Pagans, & Idolaters, adew al Religion, and welcome Atheisme. And thus thou seest, gentle reader, how contempt of Scripture must nedes folow the contempt of the Churches authoricie, which being layd aside, we haue not so much as probable assurance of Scripture or Christian Religion. Wherfore hold fast let vs with the Catholique Apostolique & Romain Church, & neuer link our selues in Religion, with the pretended reformers, who like Chammes contemne their mother the Church, lest we be inforced to shake handes with Atheistes, whose frendship we can not refuse, if we breake amitie and league with the Romain Church, as is most euidently demonstrated.

The conclusion.

How contempt of the Romain church bringethin Atheisme.

***

The fourth Chapter shevveth that in admitting some bookes of Scripture and reiecting others, they open the gap to contempt of al Scripture and religion.

VVE say commonly that a lyer had nede to haue a good memorie: for otherwise he being alwayes ready to speake, not as the truth requireth, but as he may best for the present serue his owne turne, wil be in danger to contradict himselfe, and to vary in his owne tale. For want of which memorie, the reformers do often eate their vvordes, and go from that vvhich before they stood vnto. And amongst many other examples this may serue for one, that they wil nedes receiue Scripture at the Romain Churches hand, and for this point account her authoritie sufficient, but their memorie is so short, that forgetting them selues, they vvil not accept of the number of the bookes of Scripture, vvhich she hath deliuered vnto them: although they haue not any other vvarrant of Scripture, then they haue of the number of the bookes of Scripture, vvhich is the Romain Churches authoritie. I must therfore desire them better to remember them selues. For if the Romain Church be of sufficient credit, to vvarrant vs of Scripture, vvhy is not her authoritie a sufficient vvarrant also, for the nũber of the bookes of Scripture. Or if she may erre in the nũber of the bookes of Scripture, she may erre also in Scripture and so if they vvould remember them selues better, and rubbe their brovvès harder, they vvould see plainy, that ether they should take al or none of her, becausse her authoritie is as sufficient being one & the same to vvarrant vs for the bookes of Scripture, as for Scripture. If they beleue then that there is Scripture, becausse she sayth so, they must beleue that there are so many bookes of Scriptures, becausse she also sayth so: her vvord being as good for the one as for the other. But as they are lyers, so are they forgetful, and therfore so cotrarie in their tale, that they vvil say that they beleue her in that, but not in this, vvhere as rather it folovveth, that they beleue her nether in the one nor in the other: but only do giue credit to their priuat spirit and imaginations, affirming that to be Scripture vvhich they imagin, and those

a lyer must haue a good memorie.

The reformers vvant such a memorie. an example therof. They take Scripture at the Romain Churches hand, but not the number of bookes.

vvhat bookes they reiect.

in ser. can. tit de libris vet. & noui test.

thoſe bookes only to be Scripture, vvhich their ſpirit liketh of.

2. Wherfore Luther affirmeth that the booke of Iob is but a tale, deuiſed to ſet forth an exa nple of patience before our eyes; he ieſteth at the author of Eccleſiaſtes, ſaying that he wanteth bootes & ſpurres, and therfore rideth in his ſockes, as he did vvhen he vvas a fryar. Yea he ſpareth not the new Teſtament, affirming that he liketh not of the common opinion, which aloweth of fower Goſpels: & he addeth, that S. Ihons is the only true and principal Goſpel: vvhence it followeth that the other three are not authentical. For if they vvere, then vvere al fower of equal authoritie, and ſo S. Ihons Goſpel was not the principal. He denyeth that the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes is Apoſtolical, the like is his cenſure of the Epiſtles of S. Iude, & S. Iames. Caluin reiecteth the bookes of Wiſdom, of Eccleſiaſticus, of Iudith, of the Machabees, of Tobie. And vvhy? truly for no other reaſon, then that theſe bookes ſeme moſt contrarie to diuers points of their doctrin. For otherwiſe, ſeing that they can not diſcerne Scripture from other vvritings, but by the cenſure of the Romain Church, as is proued in the laſt Chapter, they haue no reaſon to receiue ſome bookes on he vvord & not al, ſeing that ſhe giueth the ſame teſtimonie of al.

Præf. in nouum Teſt.

Præfat. in Heb.

Præfat. li. 1. Inſt c 11 8. l. 2. c. 5. 18. l. 8 c 5. 8. Aut. ſeſs. 14.

3. But giue an Atheiſt this aduantage, and vvhat wil he ſay? he wil tel the Reformers, that he ſeeth no other warrant which they haue for the Epiſtle to the Romains, then for the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes, and the Epiſtle of S. Iames: nor for S. Iohns Goſpel, more then for the other three? nor for Geneſis more then the firſt and ſecond booke of the Machabees, Tobie, Iudith, and Iob: and that therfore if the reformers deny theſe, he wil deny al the other, becauſe if the Romain Churches vvarrant (for they haue no other vvarrant as in the former Chapter is proued) be not ſufficient for ſome of theſe bookes, it can be no ſufficient vvarrant for any. And ſo he wil ſay, that you may as wel deny al ſcripture, as ſome bookes of ſcripture, or if you vvil not, he wil deny it for you, and ground him ſelfe in your owne doctrin.

Vvhat an Atheiſt may ſay to this.

4. And he wil yet go farther and auouch that if he may doubt of Scripture, as vvhy not, becauſe there is no other vvarrant for it but the Romain Churches vvord, he wil doubt alſo of the contentes of Scripture, and ſo he wil cal in queſtion Moyſes, Chriſt, the Apoſtles, the Trinitie, the Incarnation, the Paſſion of Chriſt and Reſurrection, and al the Myſteries of Chriſtian Religion. Wherfore as you credit the Romain Church for Scripture, ſo giue her credit for the number of the bookes of Scripture, becauſe her word and warrant is as good for the

Hovv this bringes in contempt of religion.

as ſ

as for that; or if you vvil not beleue her in this, you can haue no assurance of any part of Scripture, & so you may bring al into question; vvhence foloweth contempt of al Religion, as is before proued.

The fifth Chapter proueth, that their dissension in Religion openeth the gap to contempt of al Religion.



The force of Religion.

NOTHING is of more force then Religion, vvhich kepeth vs in awe, bridleth our appetites, ruleth our actions, gouerneth out life, and inculcateth vnto vs our dutie towards God & man. And if there vvere no other argumẽt, then the example of so many thousand Martyrs, vvho haue endured so exquisite torments and so horrible deathes rather then they would deny their Religion, it were sufficient to beare witnes for Religoni, that it is of greater force then al the violence of the Tyrantes, then al their engines and instrumentes of crueltie, yea then death it selfe. But as the force of a riuer is great, and so great, that sometymes it ouerthroweth houses, and bridges, and beareth downe al vvhich standeth in the way of his streame, but yet diuide it into many litle brookes, and a childe vvil resist his force: euen so religion is of great force & efficacie, and beareth a great svvay in the life of man, but yet if it be diuided into diuers sectes, it looseth force and vigour, and vvheras vvhilest it remaineth vnited, it vvil not be resisted, vvhen it is diuided it is easily cõtemned. I haue already described the iarres, and dissensions of the Reformers in matters of religion, and by this marke I haue descried them to be heretikes. Hovv let vs see vvhat an aduantage this their dissention giueth to an Atheist, and what a wide gap it openeth vnto Atheisme.

The force of a riuer vnited, and hovv vvheake it is, deuided.

So religion.

See the second booke chap. 6.

Dissension of heretikes.

An Atheists argument grounded in diuersitie of sectes.

2 An Atheist, out of these their diuersities of opinions may easily draw this discourse. I see sayth he (or at least he may say) diuers sects and opinions, diuers Synagogues, and Religions, diuers conuenticles and congregations amongst you: vvhich as they haue diuers names, so professe they diuers doctrins, and folovv diuers Authors. For some of them are called Lutherans, some Caluinists, vvhich are by a subdiuision parted into softe and rigorous Lutherans, and into Protestants and Puritans, others are called Zuinglians, others Bezits,

others Anabaptists, others Libertins, others Brovvnists, others Martinists, others are of the Familie of loue, others of the damned crew. And although al these agree against the Romain Catholique & Apostolique Church, yet they disagree amongst them selues, and although they hold many, and those also contrarie opinions, yet they al vse one argument to proue their opinions, to vvit Scripture sensed by their priuate spirit. And so vvil this Atheist say, if I beleue one of these sectes, I must beleue al, because they alleage one proofe for their religion; but seing that I can not beleue al, because they teach contrarieties, lest I do any partial vvrong in preferring one before an other, al hauing the same reason I wil beleeue none of them al, nor none of their opinions. And seing that they contemne the Catholique Romain religion, for a fardel of superstitions (which uotvvithstanding was euer counted the true Christian religion euen hy the Pagans themselues, who therfore presequuted it) and haue no reason to bynd me to any of their religiós, vnlesse I wil be bond to an impossibitie, that is to be of al their religions, and nether can with any reason perswade me to be ether Turke or Iewe, I may by authoritie be of no religion. And thus Atheisme must nedes folow diuision in religion & cõtempt of the Romain Church.

The Conclusion.

Hovv Atheisme entereth.

The sixth Chapter shevveth, hovv their vvant of a visible head geueth a great aduantage to Atheists, and such as mocke at al religion.

IN the first booke and Sixt chapter, I haue declared at large, how necessarie a visible head is in al societies, and especially in the Church of Christ, & I haue also demonstrated, that there is no such visible head in the Synagogue of the reformers. whence I haue inferred, that amõgst them it is lawful, for euery heretike to preach what doctrin he wil, and no man shal controle him. Now I am to deduce an other conclusion, to wit, that thus also the vvay is opened vnto Atheistes, godlesse, and irreligious persons: which I can do easily, and wil do in a word. For if a visible head be vvanting, euery man may preach and imbrace what Religion he vvil

wil (as in the alleaged place I haue proued) & seing, that if this head be wanting, there is no certaintie of any religion, but only the priuate spirit, and bare Scripture, which are altogether vncertaine, as before is proued, it wil folow that a man shal haue no more reason to imbrace one religion then an other, yea he shal haue no probable reason to induce him to any religion at al, and consequenty he may take good leaue to be of no religion. And thus he may argue in forme and figure.

In the first booke, ch. 2. 3.

2. If there be no visible head to determine by authoritie vvhat religion is to be imbraced, euery man may be of vvhat religion he wil, & no mã can cõtrole him, & so I also may vse my libertie in choosing my religiõ, as wel as an other. And seing that if the authoritie of a visible head be layd aside, I haue no more reason to be of one religion then an other (because al religions alleage the same reason which is no reason, to wit, bare Scripture sẽsed by the priuate spirit) and I can not possibly be of al, because they be contrarie one to an other I may by good reason refuse to be of any religion, and no man can controle me for it, if there be no visible head, who can proue that he hath authoritie to determine of religion. And so he that forsaketh the Catholique Church, where only this visible head is to be found, hath leaue and licence to be of what religion he wil, yea to be of no religiõ at al, because leauing that, he hath no more reason to be of one religion then an other, because he hath no other reason then bare Scripture sensed by a priuate spirit, which is not sufficient, as is proued in my first booke & third chapter, yea leauing the Catholique Church, he cã not haue any probable reason to induce him to any of these new religions, as I haue proued in my first booke, and fifth chapter, and seing that God nether can, nor wil cõmand him to be of a religion, for which he seeth no reason, nor motiue vvhich is sufficient to induce a reasonable man, as in the same place is proued, he may vvith reason, after he hath left the Catholique Church, ioyne vvith Atheistes vvho are of no religiõ.

How vvant of a visible head bringeth in atheisme.

The Conclusion.

***

The ſeuenth Chapter shevveth hovv the Reformers, in denial of the real preſence, do ruine Chriſtian Religion, & cal al the other Myſteries of Faith in queſtion.

SACRIFICE is a thing ſo highly pleaſing and acceptable to God, that he wil haue none to be partakers vvith him in ſuch honour, but reſerueth it as an homage dew only to him ſelfe, & proper to a Diuine Maieſtie. Yet obedience is more grateful vnto him then al the Hecatombs and Sacrifices in the vvorld, becauſe by the old Sacrifices were conſecrated to his ſeruice the liues & ſubſtance of brute beaſts, but by obedience we make a burnt offering, & Holocauſt of our owne ſoules, reſigning our deſires & vvils, yea our owne ſelues, vvholly vnto his wil and pleaſure. But vvhileſt this obedience reſteth in the vvil, though it be very meritorious, yet hath it not the ful complement of perfection, becauſe ſo long as the wil hath reaſon to perſwade her, the leſſe thanks ſhe deſerueth for obeying: but vvhen this vertue reacheth to the vnderſtanding, and maketh reaſon againſt ſence and aboue reaſon, to yeld to more then reaſon can reach vnto, then hath this vertue her perfection. And this perfection ſhe hath not of her ſelfe, becauſe of her ſelfe ſhe can only ſubmit the vvil vnto the commaundment of the Superior, but ſhe is fayne to borrow ſo much of the Theoligical vertue, called Faith, vvhoſe propertie is to make the verie vnderſtanding to ſtoupe, and vvithout any reaſon to yeld to things, for vvhich there is no reaſon, becauſe they are aboue reaſon.

1. Reg 15.

Obedience more pleaſing them ſacrifice.

The perfection of obedience.

borrovved of faith.

2. Many ſuch things there are in Chriſtian faith vvhich ſeeme to ſenſe ſenſeles, to reaſon vnreaſonable, and to humain faith incredible, & (as mans reaſon can ſee) euen to Diuine power impoſſible. Amõgſt vvhich theſe three are principal, and to humain reaſon ſeme incredible, to vvit, the Trinitie, in vvhich we beleue that three are one, that is that three Perſons are one God. The Incarnatiõ, in vvhich we confeſſe, that two are one, that is two natures in Chriſt, the one Diuine, the other Humaine, are one & the ſame Perſon. The bleſſed Sacramẽt of the Altar, in which we acknowledge that bread & vvine by the

The 3. hardeſt articles of faith.

by the vertue of Christs vvord, are changed into his body & bloud, and that one body is not only in one but in diuers places at one and the selfe same time. But as these three are the hardest to conceiue of al the mysteries of Christian fayth, so hath our blessed Sauiour giuen vs more plaine and euident testimonies of them in his holy vvritte, then of any other, which are more easily to be cõceiued. For the blessed Trinitie vvhat more pregnant proofes can we desire, then we haue in S. Matthew? *Going therfore teach you al nations in the name of the Father, & of the Sonne, & of the Holy Ghost.* Where the anciẽt Fathers note that three are named, to signifie three distinct persons, and yet Christ biddeth his Apostles to baptise, in the name, not names of these three, to signifie that these three are one God. And that the Father is God, euery leafe almost of Scripture doth testifie: that the Sonne is God, many places most manifestly do beare vvitnes, & testimonie: that the Holy Ghost is God, S. Peter auerreth, vvho hauing demanded of Ananias the reason vvhy he vvould lye vnto the Holy Ghost, auoucheth that he lyed not to men but to God. Wherfore S. Paul sayth, that we are the Temple of the Holy Ghost, & seing that to God only Temples are erected, if we be his Temple he is our God. Now that these three are one God, S. Iohn wil acertaine vs, for (sayth he) *three there are vvhich giue testimonie in heauen, the Father, the Vvord, & the Holy Ghost, & these three are one.* No lesse pregnant proofes doth holy vvrit afforde vs for the Incarnition, in which mysterie we confesse one Diuine Person, Christ Iesus, to be true God and man. And first let the Father speake for his Sonne. *This is my beloued Sonne, in vvhom I haue taken great pleasure.* Secondly let the disciple speake for his maister: *Thou art the Sonne of the liuing God.* Let an other disciple, & no other then he vvhom Iesus loued, because he loued, tel vs his opinion in this point: he sayth, that *in the beginning vvas the Vvord, and that the Vvord vvas vvith God, yea vvas God.* And afterward he sayth, that this word was made flesh, that is, became man. Let Christ him selfe be credited also in this matter because he is the truth: vvhen the Iewes told him that he had not yet 50. yeares of age, and therfore could not see Abraham: he ãswered *that he vvas before Abraham*, and yet the same Christ is called by S. Mathew, the sonne of Abrãham, vvhich must nedes argue two natures in one person of Christ, the one Diuine, in respect of vvhich he vvas before Abraham, the other Humaine, by vvhich he vvas after Abraham, as the sonne is after the father: and so the selfe same Person is God and man, and that man Iesus that liued in earth and conuersed amongst vs, is the na-

proofe of the Trinitie.

cap. vlt.

Rom 1. 3.

Tit. 1. 3.

Iuda. 2.

Mat. 16.

Act. 5.

1. Io. 5.

Proofes of the Incarnation.

Mat. 3.

cap. 16.

Io. 1.

Io. 8.

Mat. 1.

the natural Sonne of God, & the word of God, is the word Incarnate who in respect of his Diuinitie was before Abraham, but in respect of his Humain nature, was long after him.

The Eucharist.

3. Now as cõcerning the third Mysterie, if a bring not as plaine text for it, as can be brought for the others, I will grant the victorie to myn aduersarie. But to auoid multitude of allegations, I wil make choise of two places only, which seme to me to be the plainest. And the first shalbe taken out of the sixt of S. Iohn, which chapter although of some it be expounded only of spiritual eating of Christ,

Io. 6. proued out of S. Ihon. c. 6.

yet by the common consent of interpreters speaketh not only of spiritual, but also of a Sacramental and real eating, as shal be made most manifest. For first our Sauiour Christ to dispose them to a firme beleefe of this Mysterie, made such a multiplication and increase of

Vvhy Christ multiplied loaues.

fiue barley loaues and two fishes, that he fed and filled aboue fiue thousand persons therwith, and that so sufficiently, that the fragments of the banquet were as much as the whole feast. For if he

This miracle applied to the Eucharist.

could make so much of a litle, why can he not turne bread and wine into his body, and if he could without diminution of the feast satisfie so many, why may he not fede vs al with his body, without diuision or diminution of the same? And if after that fiue thousand had eaten their fil of the loaues and fishes, the fragments and reliques, which they left, were as much as the feast with which they were filled, why should it seme impossible, that Christs body should be eaten of vs, and yet remaine in the pix or altar, or that after the communicants haue receiued it, the reliques which they leaue, should

Secondly. Christs discourse.

remaine stil as great as the whole banquet was Secondly after that miracle was wrought, because there was a great agrement, betwixt it and the blessed Sacrament, thus he taketh the occasion to discourse with them of it, and to induce them to the beleefe of the same, *Amen amen I say to you, you seke me not because you haue sene signes, but because you did eate of the loaues, and were filled*: so swete a tast had that miraculous banquet, and such contentment it gaue, though of it selfe it was meane, that they folowed him for the good cheare he made them. but saith Christ, *worke not the meat that perisheth, but that which endureth to life euerlasting, which the Sonne of man will giue you.* They answered, *what shal we do, that we may worke the workes of God? This is the worke of God* (sayth Christ) *that you beleue in him whom he hath sent. What signe* (say they) *doest thou, for which we should beleue thee? Our fathers did eate Manna in the desert, and God gaue them bread from heauen to eate.* Here Christ beginneth

to close

a cloſe with them, & to enter into his intended diſcourſe of the bleſ-
ed Sacramẽt. *True* (ſayth Chriſt) *but Moyſes gaue you not the bread from heauen*
but my father geueth you the true bread from heauen. Lord (ſayd they) *giue vs al-*
wayes this bread. Ieſus anſwered, *I am the bread of life.* At which the Iewes
murmured, becauſe they vnderſtood him not. And yet moſt fitly is he
alled the bread of life. For firſt in Scripture al that nouriſheth is cal-
ed bread: wherfore ſeing that Chriſt is the food of our ſoule, wel is
e called bread, & not whatſoeuer bread, but the bread of life, to diſtin-
iſh him frõ cõmon bread. Secõdly in Scriptures when one thing is
hanged into an other, that into which the chãge is made, taketh the
ame of the thing changed. So the ſerpẽt into which Aarons rod was
hanged is called a rod, becauſe it was made of a rod: & becauſe bread
as to be changed into Chriſts body, wel he is called bread. Thirdly
ecauſe his body was to be couered with the formes of bread, it is cal-
d bread, for that it hath the ſhew & forme of bread, & for this cauſe
is bloud is called *vvine*, and the *bloud of the grape*, becauſe it vvas to be
ueſted as it vvere, vvith the accidentes of vvine in the ſame bleſſed
acrament. And norwithſting the Iewes murmuration Chriſt wil
ot eate his vvord, but againe he repeteth it: *I am the bread of life, your*
thers did eate manna in the deſert, and they dyed, this is the bread that deſcended
om heauen, that if a man eate of it he dyeth not. And I (ſayth he) *am this liuing*
read that came frõ heauen, of vvhich he that eateth ſhal liue for euer, and the bread
at I vvil giue, is my fleſh for the life of the vvorld. Now he ſpeaketh his
ynd plainly, and ſo plainly that he compareth the figure with the ve-
itie, *manna* vvith his bread of the bleſſed Sacrament, and giueth the
reeminence to the veritie: for (ſayth he) *your fathers did eate of manna*
nd yet dyed, but *my manna is a more ſoueraine viand* becauſe vvhoſoeuer
reth of it ſhal liue for euer.

The firſt reaſon vvhy Chriſt is called bread.

Second.

Exod. 7.

Third.

Gen. 46.

3. Now if it be true, that the bleſſed Euchariſt is only a ſigne of Chriſts body and bloud, then I demand of our aduerſaries vvith what ſhew of truth Chriſt could preferre it before *mãna?* Why ſhould Chriſts bread giue life rather then *manna*, ſeing that *manna* ſignified Chriſt, who is this bread, as wel as the Euchariſt? Yea vnleſſe the Euchariſt contain Chriſts fleſh and bloud really, *manna* muſt nedes take the pre-cedence in dignitie, as it hath in antiquitie. For firſt *manna* was better in ſubſtance, as being made by Angels handes, and in the aire, hauing alſo al taſtes, as is before declared, and ſo in ſubſtance *manna* is more excellent in figure and ſignification. *manna* is as good if not better. for if the Euchariſt contain not really Chriſts body and bloud, it is but a

Sap. 16.

Pſal. 77.

See the fourth booke chap. 6.

The real preſence proued by the figure Manna.

signe, and consequently no better then *manna*, because it signified the same Christ, and so vvas as noble a signe, and it vvas more apt to signifie, and so vvas a fitter figure. for as *Manna* vvas framed by Angels handes, and neuer passed the heate of the fyer: so Christ our bread of life vvas framed by the King of Angels fingers, vvithout al helpe of man, and vvas baked in the ouen of the Virgins vvomb, vvithout al heate of concupiscence. As vvhen God rayned downe *Manna*, the Iewes cried *Manhu!* that is, *Vvhat is this!* So vvhen Christ proposed his *Manna* the Capharnaites murmured. That *Manna* vvas giuen to the Iewes in the desert, this to Christians in the vvildernes of this vvorld only, for in the next vvorld, I meane in heauen, our only home and land of promise, we shal not fede any more of Christs body by eating or cõmunicating, but we shal tast of the swetnes of his Diuinitie by fruition. *Manna* vvas vvhite, but yet vvas no common bread, and it vvas like a coriander sede, but yet was not of any such substance. and this *Manna* in externe forme and colour seemeth bread, but in dede is the body of Christ. That vvhen it vvas measured was found to be of one measure in al the gatherers hands, and this *Manna* although some haue great hostes some litle ones, although some receaue whole hostes some but a peece, some many hostes some one only, yet when by faith it is measured, we find as much in the litle hoste as in the great, as much in the pece as in the whole hoste, and as much in few yea in one as in many. That *manna had al tastes*, and those most delicate, according to the eaters desire, and this it had not of his owne nature but of God vvho gaue it such a supernatural vertue: So hath this *Manna* also, because it tasteth to our soules, according to our deuotion & desire, & though it be but flesh, yet it feedeth the soule, not by the vertue of common flesh, for to the soule flesh of it selfe *non prodest quicquam, profiteth nothing*, but by a supernatural vertue, vvhich it receueth by the strange coniunction that it hath vvith the diuinitie, euen as the hot iron burneth, not as iron but as it is vnited to the fire. And seing that such conuenience, and agreement can not be found betwixt bare bread & Christs body, it foloweth, that if the Eucharist be but bread in substance, that *Manna* vvas a better signe then it, and so the figure shal excel the veritie, and the shadow shal surpasse the body, and the promise the performance.

Ex.16.Ioan.6
The application of Manna to the b. Sacr.
Sa.16.

4 But let vs go on. After that our Sauiour had told the Iewes that he was the bread of life, which descended from heauen, and giueth life euerlasting, which manna could not do, because it only e-

tinguis-

tinguished hunger, and prolonged life for a tyme, the Iewes murmured once again, and grombled at the matter, yea, as the text sayth, *they stroue amongest them selues saying, how can he giue vs his flesh to eate?* But Christ wil not goe from his former words, rather now he threatneth, that *vnlesse they eate his flesh, and drinke his bloud, they shal haue no life in them.* And he inculcateth again and again, that *his flesh is meat in dede and that his bloud is drinke in dede, that he that eateth him shal liue by him*; that his bread *is the bread that came dovvne from heauen, and so forth.* Whereforе, now many of his disciples begin to stagger, saying that *this is a hard speach not to be endured.* But yet Christ for al this their scandal, changeth not his tune nor renour of wordes. Only because he knew, that the matter was hard and high of which he spake, he seeketh to induce them to beleue this Mysterie, by an other of as great difficultie. Doth this, sayth he, scandalize you, that I say you must eate my flesh and drinke my bloud? if then you shal see me ascend, from vvhence I descended, you wil much more be scandalized. But yet to take away as much scandal as I may, & to ease your vnderstanding as much as the Mysterie wherof I talke wil permit: *It is the spirit that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the vvordes vvhich I haue spoken vnto you be spirit and life.* That is, you must not conceue any horrour in that I tel you, that you must eate my flesh, for you must not imagin, that I wil giue it you raw or rosted, as the meate which commeth from the shambles or kitchin, I wil giue it you after a spiritual maner, hiding it from your eyes, vnder the veale of a Sacrament, and in this spiritual maner it shal profit you, for as for that carnal maner in which you do imagin, that I wil giue you my flesh, it profiteth nothing. Or if you thinke it impossible that flesh should giue life, it is not flesh only that can do it, because flesh alone profiteth nothing, but it is the spirit of the Diuinitie and flesh vnited to this spirit that quikneth, for as (S. Austin sayth) if flesh could profite nothing, *Verbum caro non fieret vt habitaret in nobis, the Word vvould not haue bene made flesh to dvvel amongst vs.* So that Christ meaneth that they must eate his flesh, not only in a figure (for so they had eaten it in the paschal lambe) nor only by faith (for so their forfathers and al that euer beleued in Christ had eaten Christ, & therfore at this eating they could not haue bene scandalized) but he speaketh of a real eating though in a spiritual and sacramental maner, and yet the Iewes, after the explication mentioned vnderstood him not, and therfore stil they murmured, yea after this (as the text sayth) *many of his disciples vvent backe and novv they vvalked not vvith him.* Blessed Sauiour, thou that

Christ notvvithstanding they vnderstood him really yet speaketh of no figure.

Aug tract. 7 10.

Ibidem.

Ibidem.

Christes meaning.

cameſt not to deceue, but to ſaue ſoules, if thou haue any eaſier meaning then that is, in which theſe men do take thee, tel it them out of hand, to helpe their vnderſtanding. If thou meaneſt only an eating of thee in a figure, or by faith only, as Caluin & Zuinglius do interprete thee, do but ſay ſo, and thou ſhalt take away from theſe men al cauſe of ſcandal, and murmuration: becauſe they are wel accuſtomed to figures, vvhoſe vvhole law was figuratiue, and they can eaſily conceiue how they may eate thee ſpiritually by faith, becauſe that is only to beleue in Chriſt & the Meſſias, vvhich thy diſciples, that ſtagger at theſe thy words, do already beleue, and al their forfathers haue long ſince beleued. But Chriſt wil giue them no ſuch eaſie anſwer: vvhich ſheweth that he ſpoke nether of figuratiue eating only, nor ſpiritual only, but of real eating of his fleſh, though in a ſpiritual maner. What then anſwereth our Sauiour to theſe afflicted people, nothing at al more, then vvhich already he hath anſwered, but now he turneth to the twelue Apoſtles, ſaying. *Vvhat vvil you alſo depart?* As if he had ſayd: I haue told you a high Myſterie, at which many murmure, many are ſcandalized, & for vvhich many haue left me, but I haue no other thing to ſay, faith is here required, vvithout vvhich none can come to me or my Father, none can beleeue this Myſterie: And they that wil not captiuate their vnderſtanding to the obedience of faith, let them goe, but wil you my twelue vvho are vſed to my Myſteries be gone alſo? S. Peter anſwereth for al twelue (not knowing Iudas infidelitie, vvhom notvvithſtanding Chriſt calleth a diuel for the ſame) *Lord, to vvhom ſhal vve goe: thou haſt the vvordes of eternal life.*

2. *Annotations out of Chriſtes diſcourſe.*

The firſt.

5. Out of this diſcourſe I gather two thinges for my purpoſe: firſt that the Iewes vnderſtood Chriſt, not of a figuratiue or ſpiritual eating by faith, becauſe ſuch eating could not haue ſcandalized them, vvho were accuſtomed to ſpiritual eating, neither would ſuch meates haue gone againſt their ſtomake, becauſe figuratiue diſhes vvere their ordinarie fare. Secondly I gather that Chriſt meant not figuratiue or ſpiritual eating only, but ſacramental and real eating. For if he had meant ſo, he no doubt vvould haue explicated himſelfe, to take away al occaſion of offence & ſcandal, vvhich they conceiued, becauſe they vnderſtood him of real eating, as is proued: or if Caluin wil nedes haue it, that Chriſt meant only figuratiue and ſpiritual eating, he muſt nedes ſay withal, that Chriſt vvas moſt cruel, and peremptorie, and that he endeuoured rather to deceue ſoules, then to ſaue them, and to blind them rather then to illuminate them: who, though he perceiued

The ſecond.

that

hat they vnderstood him of his flesh, vvhich scandalized them, yet would not voutsafe to tel them, that he meant only a figuratiue and spiritual eating, that so with a word he might haue taken away the scandal, taught them the truth, and geuen the deceiued soules satisfaction.

6. My second argument shal be deduced out of the words of our Sauiour, vvhich he vsed, in the institution of this Sacrament: *This is my body, this is my bloud*: or, *this is the Chalice of my blond*. What could he haue sayd more plainly? Tel me Caluin, if Christ vvould haue giuen vs to vnderstand, that he meant to giue vs no bare figure but his true body, vvhat playner vvords could he haue vsed? he might haue sayd (sayth Caluin) This is my true body: but might not yet Caluin haue vsed his ordinarie glosse and haue sayd, that he ment only to say that it is the true figure of his body, or the figure of his true body? And I demand of Caluin, vvhether Christ vvas able to turne bread in to his body, as before he turned vvater into vvine, and multiplied the loaues & fishes? If he say he could not, I aske vvhy? If he answer, it semeth impossible: I must nedes tel him, that he taketh much vpon him, in confining Gods power within the narrow compasse of his shalow head: as though God could do iust as much as Caluin can conceiue, but no more. Al the ancient Fathers, though they could not conceiue this Mysterie, yet becausc Christ calleth that vvhich was in his hands, his body, do confesse that Christ vvas able to do it, becausc they knew he could do more then they could conceiue. And why could he not do this as vvel as he hath done the like? speake Caluin, and tel vs vvhere lyeth the difficultie, vvhich maketh thee with Iudas and the Capharnaites, to thinke that Christ can not giue vs his body really? either thy reason is becausc he can not turne bread into a mans body: and vvhy I pray thee can he not as wel turne one thing into an other, as create a thing of nothing? Vvhy can he not turne bread into his body, and vvine into his bloud, who turned water into wine, a rod into a serpent, and a serpent into a rod, and a rocke into vvater. Yea he that turned vvater into bloud, can he not turne wine into bloud? Or elsc the reason is, becausc a mans body can not be in so litle a roome, as is a litle hoste or a litle peece of the same: And vvhy can he not make a great body to be in a litle roome, as he can make two bodyes, by penetratiō to be in one roome, vvithout enlarging the place: which he did vvhen by penetration he issued out of the virgins vvomb, vvithout breaking her virginal closet, & whē he came out of the graue without remouing the stone,

The second argument.
Mat. 26. *Mar.* 14. *Luk* 22. 1. *Cor.* 11.
Io. 2. *Io.* 6.
Caluin a Capharnaite.
Io. 2. *Exod* 2. *Psal.* 77. *Exod.* 7.
that God can turne bread into his body.
Mat. 1. 2. *Mar.* 16. *Lu.* 24.
that a great body may be in a litle roome.

stone, entered into his disciples the dore being shut, & passed through al the heauens in his Ascension, vvithout diuision of those incorruptible bodyes? or else the reason is, because one body can not be in diuerse places. And vvhy may not one body be in diuers places, as well as diuerse bodyes by penetration vvere in one place in his natiuitie, and resurrection, in his entrance into the house, vvhere his disciples vvere, and in his Ascension into heauen, and aboue al the heauens? Briefly it is no more repugnant, for a body to be in a litle roome or in diuerse places at once, then for a mans body to stand vpright vpon the vvater and not to sinke, as Christs and S. Peters bodyes did: or for a heauy body to ascend in the vvater as the head of a hachet did, neither is it more impossible for a body to occupie more place then his owne quantitie is, then for a body to liue a longer age then nature will afforde, and yet Ezechias liued longer, and Elias and Henoch are yet liuing.

and in diuers places.

Mat. 14.
4. Reg. 6.

Caluins obiection.

7. But Caluin vvil say, that it is no more necessarie to vnderstand Christ really in these vvordes *this is my body*, then in diuerse others, in vvhich he sayth *I am the dore*, *I am the vine*: or in those, *Christ vvas the rock*, or in those, *behold the lambe of God*. But by Caluins leaue there is much more reason, vvhy we should vnderstād Christ really in those words, *This is my body*, then in the other wordes alleaged. For when Christ sayd, *This is my body*, he made his last vvil and testament, at vvhich tyme men speake plainly, & not in parables or figures, lest that the heyres should take occasion to vvrangle, and to sew ech other in the law, about the meaning of the vvil: then also he enacted a law and instituted a Sacrament, in vvhich proper and plain vvordes are required. he spoke also those vvordes to his Apostles, to vvhom he vsed not to speake in *parables* but in plaine wordes, or if he chanced to speake obscurely to them, they vsed to desire him to explicate him selfe, vvhich here they did not, or else some one of the Euangelistes vvould haue explicated this figuratiue speech, as they vsed in other matters to do: yea vvhen Christ spoke these vvordes, he lifted vp his eyes to heauen, and blessed the bread vvhich he neuer did, but some great miracle folowed, as appereth by the miracles of the multiplication of loaues and fishes, and such like, vvhich argeweth some real change in the substance of bread: which can be no other then trāsubstantiation, the very vvordes, *this is my body*, importing no lesse. Secondly he sayd in the present tense *this is my body vvhich is giuen for you*: *This is my bloud vvhich is shed for you*. For so the Greek text teacheth vs: vvhich addition also ar-

The answer. first.

Mat. 13.
Mat. 15.
Io 2. 12. 15.
Mat. 16.

Io. 6.

Secondly.

gueth

gueth some thing, that then vvas offred for them: and seing that bread and vvine could only be offered to them, but not for them, nor for remission of their sinnes, it folovveth, that Christ then made an oblation & Sacrifice vnbloudy, of his body and bloud, as is before, vpon an other occasion, proued. Vvich S. Paul confirmeth saying that Christ sayd *this is my body vvhich is broken for you* (for so the greek vvord signifieth) to signifie that Christs body vvas really vnder the accidentes of bread and vvine, else it could not haue bene sayd, to haue bene broken, in respect of the accidents of bread vvhich are broken: vvherfore S. Chrisostom saith, that Christ vvho vvould suffer no bones to be broken on the crosse, vvas broken in the Sacrament. Thirdly if Christ had geuen them but bare bread, or a bare signe of his body, he vvould neuer haue added *this is my body vvhich is geuen for you*, becausе that argueth a real geuing of his real body, and therfore vvhen he sayd I am the vine, he added not, vvho suffred on the crosse, nor any such like wordes: and although pointing to the image of Cesar vve say sometymes, behold Cesar, or, this is Cesar, yet not so aptly can vve say of the image, this is Cesar that ouercame Pompey, becausе that addition argueth Cesar in person. Fourthly when vve speake metaphorically, we name and expresse the thing, so Christ expressed him selfe, vvhen he sayd I am a vine, so S. Paul named him expressely, vvhen he sayd, Christ vvas a rocke, so S. Ihon pointed at him, vhen he sayd *behold the Lambe of God*, and seing that Christ remaining Christ, can not be truly a vine, a rocke, or a lambe, we easily perceue that such speches are to be taken metaphorically. And so if Christ had sayd, this bread is my body, we must haue vnderstood him figuratiuely, and metaphorically, becausе bread remaining bread can not be really his body: but for as much as Christ sayd only, *in confuso*, *confusedly*, this is my body, we must vnderstand him really, & so the sense of these vvordes must be: this vvhich I haue in my handes, is truly & really my body.

1. Cor. 11.

Thirdly.

Fourthly.

8. Lastly the greeke text in S. Luke is sufficient to demonstrate this veritie, vvhere speaking of the chalice he hath these wordes, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν, τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον. This chalice the new Testament in my bloud, vvhich is shed for you. Wherby it is plaine, that the pronoune (*vvhich*) is referred vnto the noue *chalice*, vvith vvhich word it only agreeth in concord of Grammar, and not vvith the vvord *bloud*. So that this is the clere sense of those vvordes: *This is the chalice the nevv Testament in my bloud,*

Which

vvhich *chalice is shed for you.* Where the continent is taken for the contained, the material chalice or cup can not be shed, & seing that vvine can not be sayd to be shed for vs, it must nedes folow that Christs bloud was in the chalice, because that only was shed for vs. Vvhich text is so plaine, that Beza confesseth, that it must nedes be translated *quod poculum funditur, vvhich chalice is shed for you,* if vve vvil folow the Grammatical construction, yet because thus he maketh an argument against him selfe, he translateth it *qui pro vobis funditur, vvhich blood is shed for you,* saying that thus it should be, & that either the Euangelist made a solecisme, or that the text is corrupted. But in the one he is very lauish to correct the Euangelist, in the other he lyeth, because al the greeke copies haue it as I haue set it downe. By this it is manifest, that as Christ promised, that he vvould geue his body and bloud to be eaten and drouken really, as is proued in the first argument, so he gaue really his body and bloud to his Apostles at his last supper, vnder the formes and accidents of bread and vvine. And so the text and letter of Scripture is plain for the real presence: & that the letter is to be vnderstood really as it soundeth, and not metaphorically, tropically, or figuratively, I haue proued by many arguments, and plaine discourse of Christ vvith his disciples, in the first argument, and by many circumstances and euident signes in the second argument.

In Annot. The text is for the real presence.

9. Yet because euery man must be beleued in his Art, especially vvhen there is no suspicion of partialitie, I vvil proue the meaning of Christs vvordes to be real & literal, & not figurative or spiritual only, by the authoritie of the ancient Fathers, whose art & profession vvas to interprete Scripture: in which also they vvere so conning, that for the same, they are as famous amongst Christians, as Aristotle for Philosophie, or Cicero for eloquence, Homer, Virgil, and Ouid, for poetrie, Liuie and Salust for historie, vvho also can not be suspected to fauour partially one side, rather then an other, because they are more ancient then either the Catholiques or the Reformers of this tyme. And hauing these men on my side, I vvil not feare to shew my selfe in the field against al the pretending reformers in the vvorld, because hauing them on my side, I shal haue many moe to fight for me, then against me. And as hauing them on my side I may take courage, so my aduersaries if they had any forhead, vvould be ashamed, so few to stand in field against so many: so young vpstartes against so ancient Captaines (who most of them haue vanquished one Archheretike and sect after or other, by their learned vvritings) so vnlearned against

The interpreters also.

he may be bold that is so backed.

againſt ſo learned: ſo vicious againſt ſo renowmed Saintes, & ſo light miniſters againſt ſo graue Paſtors and Prelates. But becauſe a Chapter is not a field large and ſpacious ynough, to muſter al theſe ſouldiars of Chriſt together, I wil only bring forth a fewe of them, and thoſe that ſpeake very plainly, and conſequently do ſtrike moſt forcibly: & for the orhers I vvil refere the Reader to Cardinal Allen, Bellarmin, Suarez, Gregorius de Valentia, and others, vvho haue brought them al into the field, and placed euery one of them in his ranke and ſtation, that is, in the tyme & age, in vvhich they liued. And becauſe al theſe Fathers, ether expreſly do interpret the vvords aforeſayed, *This is my body*, or at leaſt do ground them ſelues vpon them, or allude vnto them, their ſayings may wel ſerue for interpretations of the text alleaged.

Vide Ioan. Garet. de præſentia corp. xpi.

Fathers teach the real peeſence.

10 S Ignatius, S Paules Scholar hath theſe vvords: *non gaudeo corruptibili nutrimento, panem Dei volo, panem cæleſtem, qui eſt caro Chriſti & Filij Dei vivi, & potum volo ſanguinem eius: I reioice not in corruptible nutriment, I vvil haue the bread of God*) he alludeth to Chriſt vvords in S Iohn, vvhere he calleth him ſelfe bread *the heauenly bread, vvhich is the fleſh of Chriſt & the Sonne of the liuing God, & I vvil haue the drinke vvhich is his bloud*

Ep. ad Rom.

Io. 6.

To vvhich vvords Caluin can not ſhape any reaſonable anſwer, vnles he vſe much violence, in vvreſting the text: for he calleth the Euchariſt incorruptible nutrimẽt, Caluins Supper is as corruptible as bread, he calleth it the bread of God and bread celeſtial, alluding to Chriſts vvordes, vvho of his owne fleſh and not of common bread, pronounced thoſe vvordes *I am the liuing bread, vvhich deſcended from heauen*, Caluins bread hath no higher ſource and origin from vvhich it is deſcended, then the backhouſe or ouen. This bread he calleth the fleſh of Chriſt the Sonne of God, & this drinke he auoucheth to be the bloud of Chriſt, vvheras Caluins bread and vvine is but bread and vvine, or but a ſigne of the fleſh & bloud of Chriſt, but in dede it is no ſigne at al, becauſe Chriſt inſtituted that bread for a ſigne & Sacrament, which is conſecrated by a Prieſt, vvhich conſecration Caluins bread hath not, becauſe his Miniſters are no Prieſtes as I haue demonſtrated. But becauſe Caluin might by a violent gloſſe affirme that Ignatius calleth the Euchariſt incorruptible meate, celeſtial, and the bread of God, becauſe it is a ſigne of Chriſts fleſh, which is incorruptible, & celeſtial, and the bread of God, I vvil bring places, that can admit no gloſſing. And firſt of al I wil bring ſome Fathers, vvho ſay that this Sacrament is not a bare figure, but is the true fleſh of Chriſt. S. Chryſoſtome, that

Io. 6.

Caluins bread not ſo much as a ſigne.

See the fourth looke chap. 1.

golden Mouth of the Church of Christ, stoppeth Caluins mouth, with these words: *semetipsum nobis commiscet & non fide tantum, verum & reipsa nos suum corpus efficit; he doth mingle himselfe with vs, & not only by faith but also in very dede he maketh vs his body.* Caluin sayth that we eate Christ only by faith, & consequently that his substance is not really vnited to our substance, because according to his opinion, they are distant as farre as heauen and earth, but S. Chrisostom sayth, that Christs substance in this Sacrament is mingled with ours, not only by faith, but also in very dede, *ergo* in very dede Christs body is in the Sacrament, & by meanes of the Sacrament, in the receuers also & communicants. Theophilactus vvriting vpon the sixt of S. Iohn speaketh, if it be possible, more plainly: *Attende autem quod panis qui a nobis in mysterijs manducatur, non est tantum figuratio quædam carnis Domini, sed est ipsa caro Domini: Marke, that the bread vvhich is eaten of vs in the mysteries, is not a figuration* (that is an expression or figure) *of the flesh of our Lord, but it is the very flesh of our Lord.* how is it possible for the greatest Papist that is, to speake more plainly: Hilarius speaketh as plainly, as if he stroue, who should speake most plainly: *De veritate carnis, & sanguinis non est relictus ambigendi locus: nunc enim & ipsius Domini professione, & fide nostra, vere caro est &, vere sanguis est: Of the veritie of the flesh and bloud, there is no place left to doubt. For now both by our Lords profession,* and *by our faith, it is truly flesh and truly bloud.* where the vvordes, *veritie*, & *truly* are cleane opposite to Caluins figures, and spiritual manducation. S. Ciril of Hierusalem hath these vvordes: *Hoc sciens & pro certissimo habens panem hunc qui videtur a nobis non esse panem, etiamsi gustus panem esse sentiat, sed esse corpus Christi. &c Knowing this, and holding it for most certain, that this bread, vvhich is sene of vs, is not bread, although the taste iudgeth it to be bread, but the body of Christ: &* who vvould say so of a bare figure? yea who could? Can a man pointing to Cæsars picture say this which you see, is not paper, Inke, and colour layd proportionally, although the eye iudgeth so, but it is Cæsar himselfe? Can we say, pointing to baptisme, the water vvhich thou seest is not vvater, though to touche, taste, and eye, it seemeth so, but it is the holy Spirit or some other thing? I grant the same S. Ciril saith that oile of Confirmation is not common oyle, but the chrisme of Christ: but he sayth not, that it is not oile, nor that it is any other naturall thing, but that it is not cõmon oile, because it is a Sacrament. Secondly the Fathers admire how Christs body remaining in heauen, is notvvithstanding receued of vs in the blessed Sacrament. S. Chrysostom as a man astonished, exclameth in this sorte. *O miraculum, ô Dei benignitas!*

Fathers that eal it really Christes body. Ho 61 ad. pop.

in c. 6. Io.

l. 8. trin.

Catech. 4. Mystagog. Fathers admiration proueth the real prayers.

Catech. 3.

tem, qui cum Patre ſurſum ſedet, in illo ipſo temporis momento omnium manibus l. 3. de Sa-
ontrectatur: O Miracle, ô Gods benignitie, he that ſitteth aboue vvith his Father in cerdot.
hat very moment (that is in tyme of Conſecration and Communion)
handled in euery ones handes! Now if Chriſt be only in the Sacrament as
n a ſigne or figure, vvhat miracle is here, vvorthy ſuch an exclama-
ion? For ſo Chriſt were only really and in his owne perſon in heauen,
nd in earth he were but as in his Image, and conſequently it were no
reater a miracle, then that the King at the ſame tyme ſhould be really
n his chamber of preſence, and yet figurately in as many other places
s he hath coynes or images. Yea this miracle the vintner maketh
layly, vvhoſe vvine is really in the caue, and at the ſame tyme in the
uie buſh, which is without the dore, for in it the wine is as in a ſigne.
. Auſtin vvondreth, how Chriſt caryed him ſelſe in his owne handes Con. 1. in
vhen he ſayd *this is my body*, vvhich is no vvonder if the Sacrament be Pſ. 33.
figure and ſigne of him, for ſo he caryeth him ſelſe, who caryeth his Fathers com-
wne image. Thirdly the Fathers compare this Sacrament with pariſon to
trange and miraculous mutations. Ireneus and Cirillus compare it ſtrange mu-
vith the Incarnation, S. Ambroſe with the Creation of the vvorld, tations.
nd the Natiuitie of Chriſt of the Virgin Mother. The ſame Ireneus, Li. 4. c. 14.
nd S. Ambroſe count it like to the conuerſion of the rod into a ſer- Cat. 4. 5 l. de
ent, of watet into bloud, and of the rocke into water, which ſtrange iis qui initi-
nutations were vvrought by Moyſes in Ægipt and in the deſert. antur c. 9.
Againe S. Ciril of Hieruſalem cõpareth it vvith the turning of water Iren l.
nto vvine at the mariage in Cana Galilea: Chriſt once changed (ſaith 3. c. 12. Amb.
e.) *by his only vvil vvater into vvine, in Cana of Galilee, vvhich vvine is nere to* l. 4. de ſear
loud, and shal he not be vvorthy to be beleued, that he hath changed vvine into c. 4. 9.
is bloud? Which compariſons were very fooliſh, if the bread & wine Catech. 4.
had no other mutation, then that of bare bread and wine, they are m. ſtag.
nade a ſigne, and as wel might they compare an Iuie buſh vnto the Fathers to ex-
ame mutations, becauſe the Iuie buſh vvhen it is hanged before the plicate this
nne, of no ſigne is made a ſigne. Fourthly as in theſe alleaged con- Sacr. mine.
erſions and mutations, the aforenamed Fathers make recourſe vnto Gods om-
Gods omnipotencie, ſo do they in the mutation of this Sacrament, nipotencie.
rouing that it vvas poſſible, becauſe God is omnipotent. S. Ambroſe l. de iis qui i-
ayth: *he that of nothing could make ſomething, can he* not turne one thing tiantur c. 9.
nto an other? And S. Ciprian ſayth, that by the omnipotencie of the Cipr ſer de
vord, the bread is made fleſh. And vvere not theſe Fathers madde, to Cana Do-
ndeuour to explicate by ſo hard examples, how Gods omnipotencie mini.
vas able to change bread into Chriſts body, vvine into his bloud, if

the mutation vvere figuratiue only, seing that the vintner vvithout omnipotencie can do the like, in making an luie bush, of no signe a signe? Fiftly they admire herein our Sauiours great charitie & bountie, who is so liberal, as to feast & fede vs, with his owne flesh & blood.

Ho 45. in Io. *Vvhat shepheard* (sayth S. Chrisostom) *feedeth his shepe vvith his ovvne blood? And vvhat say I, shepheard? many mothers there are, vvhich vvil not bestow their milke vpon their sucklyng babes, but rather do put them forth to nourcing, but Christ dealeth not so niggardly, but feedeth vs vvith his ovvne flesh and blood, and mingleth his substance vvith ours.* Now if Christ hath giuen vs only a bare signe of a his flesh & bloud, I see no such extraordinarie loue and charitie: at least herein he shewerh no more, yea not so much charitie, as he shewed to the Iewes, to vvhom he gaue manna from heauen in their extremitie, vvhich vvas a more noble substance, and a better figure then Caluins bread is. Lastly the Fathers note for a straunge thing, that Christ is eaten of vs in the blessed Sacrament, and yet neither diuided, nor diminished, nor consumed. This S. Andrew told Ægeas the Proconsul for a great miracle. I (sayth he) *do offer daylye the omnipotent God the Immaculate lambe, of vvhom vvhen al the people haue eaten, the lambe remaineth vvhole and entiere.* S. Ciprin calleth this Sacrament, *inconsumpibilem cibum, meate inconsumptible.* S. Austin speaking of this Sacrament, and of the murmuration of the Iewes, who imagined that they should teare Christs flesh carnally vvith their teeth, sayth thus: *sic reficeris, vt non deficiat vnde refi-eris: so thou art refreshed, that it is not deficient, of vvhich thou art refreshed.* And the reason is, because Christs body is glorious, and is receiued vvhole of euery one, and so is not diuided, and vvhen the formes of bread and vvine perish, Christs body leaueth them, and though one man receueth Christs body whole, yet there is neuer the lesse for an other, for he also receueth it vvhole, neither in this is there any greater difficultie, then that 5000. men should be fed with fiue barly loaues, and two fishes, and yet the reliques to be as great or more, then vvas the feast. now if Christ be not really present in this Sacrament, but only as in signe and figure, it is no more meruaile, that he is not consumed, then that a mans picture should be burnt or broken, and he receue no harme: and if we eate him only spiritually by faith, vvhat vvonder is it, that his substance is not diuided, seing that faith hath no teeth to rent or teare him.

Fathers vvonder that christ not consumed.

in vita apud Sur.

Ser de Cœna Domini

Hom 2. de verb. Apost.

Io. 6.

Chap. 4. practise.

11 I could adde to these Fathers (vvho as I haue proued in the first booke, euer vvent vvith the Chruch) the practise of the Christian vvorld, which for reuerence of this Sacrament (as Cardinal Allen noteth)

l. 1, de Eucharist. c. 20.

noteth) hath builded so goodly Chruches, erected so stately Altars prepared so rich vessels of gold and siluer, to containe this Sacrament, hath caryed it in Processiõn, and adored it: vvhich honour and homage Christians vvould neuer haue giuen it, had they thought that it vvere but bread and vvine, or a bare signe, or figure of Christs body. So that if euer there were any truth in the Church, this of the real presence is a truth, because the Scriptures are as plaine for it, as for any other mysterie of our faith, the Fathers agree in the exposition of the Scripture for the real presence, as they do in the exposition of Scriptures against the Arrians for the defence of the Trinitie, or against the Nestorians or Eutichians for the Incarnation: the practise of the ancient Chruch argueth no lesse: miracles (vnles al bookes and recordes lye) vvere alvvayes as frequent for this Mysterie, as for any. The consent of al Christians conspireth in this article, as wel as in the Trinitie, and this the Paganes knew ful vvel, vvho therfore called vs *Anthropophagos* and *Infanticidas* as vvitnesseth Tertulian. And so if we haue any truth of any Article of our faith, this is an assured veritie: & if euer there were any heresie, Caluins opinion, vvhich denyeth the real presence, is an heresie, because the autors of this opinion, were euer noted for Heretikes, as Berengarius, Wicleph, and others before them: & their folowers had particular names, as the Arians haue, they were condemned by Councels, and by that Chruch vvhich was commonly called Christian, and they haue al other markes of heretikes, set downe in the second booke, as wil easily appeare, by application of them to Caluin & his felowes. When this opinion vvas first taught the world vvondred at it, and the Pastors and Fathers of the Chruch vvrote against it, and they alleaged as plaine Scriptures against this heresie, as euer they did against Arianisme. And so, if euer there vvere any heresie in the vvorld, the denial of the real presence is an heresie.

If any truth the real presence is true.

In Apol. c. 7. Pamel ibid. Euseb. l. 5. c.

If any heresie. Caluins opiniõ is heresie.

12. Conferre now (gentle reader) the testimonies vvhich Catholiques haue for the real presence, with those vvhich the reformers alleage against it, and tel me vvhere is likest to be the truth? Catholiques haue plainer Scripture for it, then they haue against it: the Fathers also who are interpreters of Scripture stand for it, the reformers stand against it. Which are to be beleeued, thinkest thou? Whether al the Fathers, or al the Reformers, yea or euery one of the Reformers, because they agree not, and euery one wil be supreme Iudge, by his priuate spirit. They wil say Scripture must be beleued before Fathers. But this is not the question; for Scriptures are plainer for the real presence,

greater probabilitie of the real presence, then of the contrarie.

Scripture plaine for it.

sence, then those are, vvhich the reformers bring against it. And Fathers bring Scriptures to proue it, as wel as they do to disproue it: so that the question is, vvhether the Fathers are liker, to vnderstand the Scripturs rightly, rather then the reformers, yea, rather then any one of the reformers in particular. But to draw to my intended conclusion, out of al this discourse I gather, that we haue as plaine Scriptures for the real presence of Christs body & bloud in the blessed Sacrament, as we haue for the blessed Trinitie, & we are as sure of the meaning of the textes, vvhich are alleaged for the real presence, as of them, vvhich were vsed for proofe of the Trinitie or Incarnation: because the text is as plaine, and the Interpreters as many and as plaine also, that the texts make as much for the real presẽce, as for those other two mysteries. The real presence is no more impossible, nor incredible to mans conceite, then those Mysteries are, yea those are of greater difficultie. Why then do the reformers deny the Real presence, rather then the Trinitie or Incarnation? If we haue as good proofes for this as for those verities, we can not beleue those, but we must beleue this, or if these testimonies be not sufficient for the real presence, they are not sufficient for those verities, & so if notvvithstanding plaine text, circunstances of the texte, Interpreters of the texte, and practise of the Church, we deny the real presence, or doubt of it, we must necessarily doubt of the Trinitie and Incarnation, and cal them, and al the other Mysteries of Christian faith in question, for vvhich we haue no greater, nor no other profe, because one proofe is for al: and as good for the Eucharist as for any. And if al the Mysteries of christian faith be called in question, then seing that we haue no reason to ioyne with Turck or Iew in their Religiõ, we may bid adew to al Religion, and sorte our selues with Atheistes, who are of no Religion.

Fathers also.

The conclusion.

If the real presence be denyed, al Christian faith is shaked.

How Atheisme entereth.

***

The

The eight Chapter first teacheth the Reader howw to make his profit of this Survey. Secondly it shewveth howw deformed and deforming the newv Church is. Thirdly it shewveth the euidence of the Catholique & Romain Church. And lastly it proueth that out of this Church is no saluation, and so exhorteth the Reader to continewv if he be already, or to make him selfe speedily, if as yet he be not, a member of this Church.

IT is a pleasure certes to bring a stranger vnacquanted, into a S. Peters palace in Rome, or an Escuryel in Spain, or a Louer in Paris, or a Nonsuch, or Richmond, or Roial Exchange in England, and there to shew him the gorgeous building, witty conueyghances, and varietie of roomes and chambers, the rich seeling, curious caruing, and painting, and vvhat soeuer is worthy sight or admiration. But it is no lesse displeasure, if you lead not this your stranger out againe: who many tymes is so intentiue in his gazing, and so wistly admireth euery thing vvhich he seeth, that he marketh not how he entred, and so is as ignorant how to get out, as he was at first to get in. This is the fault of worldlinges, vvhom the almightie by Creatió hath brought as by the hand into the goodly palace of this vvorld, of vvhich he him selfe is not only Lord, but the Architect also and builder: but they are so occupied in gazing vpon the beautie order, disposition and richesse of the same, and do so admire the loftie roofe of this building, seled so richly with so glittering starres, and are so distracted with the sight of such varietie of thinges most admirable, vvhich in this Palace are contained: that they neuer marcke how they came into this vvorld, nether know they, nether care they how to get out: but here setting as much as they can both their hartes & desires, make that their home, which is but a place of exile & a passage to their home, & neuer thinck of the end to which they were created, and to vvhich they are to passe by this vvorld, as by an

by an Inne in the high vvay: but ether with Epicure imagin that they are created to no other end, then here to take their pleasure, or thinke with Auaxagoras that they were borne only to speculate the heauens and starres, and not by them to make a farther step to the knowledge of God, the autour and Creatour. The like is the fault of many curious wittes in England, vvho desire to peruse and read al bookes of controuersies, and to enter into euerie such discourse: and being entred they admire this, delight in that, and so they may acquaint them selues with varietie of opinions and synde matter of dispute, argument, and table talke, for the rest they care not: and so they neuer marke how they entred in, nor that God it was, vvho by his grace leadeth them into such discourses, to bring them therby vnto the knowledge of him selfe, his Church, true faith, and true Religion: nether do know nether care they how to get out of such discourses, vvith making therby their soules profit, and vvorking their owne saluation.

Lactant l. 3. de vera & falsa Rel. c. 4.

2. Wherfore (gentle reader) hauing brought thee by the reading of this booke to see and suruey the great difference betwen the Catholique Religion, and the new doctrines vvhich certayne pretended reformes haue brought into the world, I haue thought it good by this last chapter, as by an Epiloque, to shew thee how to make thy profite, and spiritual commoditie therof, vvhich vvas the end and proiect of my laboures. For this Suruey hath not only deciphered and detected the fowle and detestable absurdities of the new Religion, but also hath shewed thee the goodlie Palace of the Catholique Church, builded by our Sauiour vpon the rock of S. Peters Seat, so firmly that not al the heresies that euer haue yet bene, nor schismes, nor persecutions that haue bene raised against it, could beate it downe, & placed like a citie on a hil, a tabernacle in the sune, so hiegh, great and eminent, that it hath continually bene conspicuous and visible, yea and glorious euen in the eyes of her enimies. And I perswade my self e thou admirest the order and discipline therof, the varietie of offices and functions, the goodlie Seruice and vvorship of God, consisting in Prayer. Sacraments, and Sacrifice, vvhich in this Iererch ie thou seest: and that thou art delighted with the swetenes, & truth of the Catholique Churches doctrin vvhich is taught in her. And I hope the euident markes of the true Christian Church, Which here I haue noted, are not only motiues to draw thee thither, but also bandes to hold thee there, being once entred. But because my principal drift, and

Mat. 16.

Mat. 5.

intention

intention was, to geue thee a view of the absurdities of the new Church, I haue bene longer in the suruey of their new doctrin, then in declaration of the ancient true Religion. Neuertheles becauſe I counted it not ſufficient to shew thee what to flye, vnles I told thee alſo what to folow, in diſprouing the new Church and religion, I haue proued the old, ſetting forth one contrarie by an other: and if thou marke, before I shew the abſurditie of the heretical doctrin, I proue commonly the Catholique veritie, to make thee ſo to flye that, that thou forget not to flye to this: So that thou haſt ſeen both that the Catholique Romain Church is the onlie true Christian Church, and that the new Synagogue, called by them the reformed Church, is the moſt deformed and deforming congregation that can be.

3. And firſt how deformed it is thou couldſt not but ſee, & ſeeing thou couldſt not but deteſt & abhorre. For firſt this congregatiõ hath a very weake foundation, which is either the only pretenſe of the bare letter of Scripture, where according to their priuate ſpirite it ſemeth to make for them, though both the expoſitiõs of the ancient Fathers, & other Scriptures be plaine againſt them; or the bare aſſertiõ of their preachers without proofe of their miſſion: which hath bene the fundation of al hereſies, but ſo ſandie, and vnſtable, that though on it there hath bene ſome shew of ſtanding for a time, yet in time alſo they haue fallen, as theſe late hereſies in part are fallen already, and for the reſt, do, by their shaking & tottering alſo prognoſtigate, a ſpeedie fal, Secõdly in this congregatiõ there is no one head, to decide matters of faith, as the ſixth chapter of the firſt booke maketh manifeſt: for which defect it is a monſtrous bodie. Thirdly it is yet more monſtrous for that it hath manie heades, for al are ſuch heades, as wil not ſubiect their priuate ſpirites to anie other priuate, or common: but wil be iudges them ſelues in al things, & ſo in effect make no diſtinction of members, no ſubordination, no Hierarchie, nor order. Fourthly this bodie like ſome *Centaurus* is compacted & compounded of contrarie and diſagreeing parts. For ſome are Lutherans, ſome Demiluther anes, ſome ſofte, ſome hard and rigorous Lutheranes, ſome Antilutheranes, that is, direct oppoſit to Luther, & yet of his broode, Some Zuinglians, ſome Caluiniſtes, ſome Proteſtantes, ſome Puritanes, ſome Browniſtes, ſome Barowiſtes, and the like. Fifthly it hath al the fowle ſpottes, and vglie markes of hereſie: As I haue declared in the ſecond booke, & is compacted and patched vp of manie old hereſies raked

The newv congregation is al deformed See the firſt booke. c. 1. 2.

Li. 2.

raked & assẽbled together. And that with such Ægyptiacal darkne such filthines and ordures of vices, such horrible blasphemies, an such a sinck of lothsome stuffe, as rather sheweth it to be a stable beastes, then a Church of Christianes.

The newv congregation also maketh al deformed so much as in it lieth.

4. Neither is it deformed only but also the most deforming com panie that euer heresie brought forth. It deformeth and defaceth God so much as in it lyeth: making him the author of sinne, the onl sinner, cruel, and tyrannical, as appeareth in the fifth booke. It defo meth and disableth Christ: making him not the sonne of God, a Redemer, no spiritual Phisition, no Lawmaker, no eternal Priest, a Iudge of the quick and dead, but rather metamorphozeth him int an ignorant, passionat, desperate and damned man: as the third booke sheweth. It deformeth & defaceth the Church as in the fourth booke is shewed, auouching that she hath doted almost euer from her infan cie, making her an Idolatresse, affirming that she maintaineth manie tors: sometimes making her inuisible sometimes starke dead, & exp of being. It depriueth her of Pristhood, of Order or Hierchie, makin her headles in earth, without a visible chiefe Pastor. It hath taken fi her fiue of the seuen Sacraments, & maketh the two it hath left her of smal valew and vertue. It depriueth her of a visible and proper Sa crifice, and hath taken away the ancient solemne and deuout forme Seruice, and left almost no essential part of Religion. It hath ruine vvhere it reigneth, al Ecclesiastical disciplin and gouernment. It ha vtterly ouerthrowen vvhere it ruleth, the State of vowed Religion, condemning it as supersticious, yea pernicious: vvhich yet vvas part begune by the Apostles, and propagated by so manie Paules, An tonies, Hilaries, Basiles, Benedictes, and others. It deformeth and d spoyleth Princes depriuing them of authoritie, and their Lawes of force and vigore, their tribunals of iust terrour and estimation, as fi sixth booke declareth. It deformeth and turmoyleth al commo welthes: as is proued in the same booke, teaching dissensions & ma tenous doctrin, which breedeth ielousies distrustes, oppressiõs of peo ple, and rebellion against officers & Superiors. It hath deformed, an derogated from mans nature: despoyling vs, in their doctrin, of God image, of free wil, & al inclinatiõ to vertue, making it a dunghil, tha vaporeth nothing els but mortal sinne & al iniquitie: supposing it t feeble and impotent, that it can not, though sturred vp and ayded b Gods grace, merite anie thing at Gods hande: nor satisfie for the leas offence, nor yet resist the least tentation, as in diuers chapters of th seuenti

Act. 4.

seuenth booke is made manifest. Finally it hath deformed Religion and moral life, by bringing in dissolution of maners, irreligiositie, Atheisme, & contempt of al Religion. Of al vvhich let our countrie be iudge whether before this new doctrin came in place of the former Catholique Religion, the Iudges had euer so manie theeues and murderers brought to be tried and condemned, as since Zuinglius and Caluins opinions were embraced. And let the voice of the people geue sentence, vvhether so manie fornications, adulteries baudries, deuorcements, & rewiuing, were so rife as now in England. Let the lawyers of ancient standing tel vs plainly, vvhether vvhen the vvhole Realme professed the Catholique Religion, there was so much packing, cosening, falsifying of testaments, Indentures, obligations and other vvritings as now? And vvhether then, yea and now also, a Catholiques word were not surer then any Protestants or Puritanes obligation? By which and other their general knowen fruites, iudge discrete reader, vvhich is the good tree. *For by their fruites, our Sauiour saith, you shal knovv them.* Here I omitte to repete, what hauock they haue made of al Church ornaments, especially of siluer and gold Chalices, Crosses, Pixes, Paxes, Candlestickes, Censars, rich shrines of Reliques, Copes, vestments, yea in manie places of lead, glasse and the like, robing spoyling and wasting those holie things, vvhich deuout Catholiques thought no vvhere so wel bestowed, as vpon Gods house to Gods honour. The soules in Purgatorie are by these men, and these meanes depriued of relife, vvhich vvas vvont to be in euerie Church imperted vnto them. Yea if these new doctors could do as they say, they would depriue al penitent poore soules of the very place it selfe, by which at last they should be saued, & would thrust al those that are not fully prepared for Heauen, presently and desperatly into Hel. Yea they derogate also from the glorious Saintes in Heauen, making them vnable to heare or vnderstand our prayers, and of so litle charitie, that they care for vs, of so smal credit with their Lord and Maister, that they may nor presume to promote anie suites, or requests for their deerest freinds in the world, and vvould not haue them honored in anie religious sorte. Only this new doctrin fauoureth Hel, teaching that it is not so as vglie, commonly it is imagined, yea that is no circumscripte place, but only a remorse of conscience, and so preferreth as manie as it can thither, to amplifie the diuels dominion, assuring so manie as vvil beleue it, that al vvorkes, euen those that

as appeareth by the 8. books

Mat. 7.

Li. 3. cap. 12.

go for best, deserue hel fire, & that no man can resist the diuel, in anie tentation, but must nedes yeld vnto him, and further more leadeth to al heresies vices and atheisme, which are the very parthes yea the gates and directest entrance into hel. So you see what deformed and deforming congregation this new Synagogue is: and consequently how iust cause you that are in it, haue to hasten your selues out of it.

5. But I know what some wil say: that for sooth you see & confesse, this new Church hath manie grosse absurdities, yet because it beleueth in Christ, and the B. Trinitie, you hope in this Church and faith you may be saued. Which flatring conceipt, I haue refu-

4. chap. ted in the second booke. Where I haue shewed, that anie one heresie cutteth of from the true Church, & is cause of eternal damnation. Here only I remit you to S. Augustin: who speaking of the Pelagianes, pronounceth this sentence of them. *Neither* (saith he) *are those*

To 2. ep. 120. chap. 37. *Pelagian heretikes such as thou wouldest easily contemne, because they liue continently, and are laudable in good workes, neither do they beleue in a false Christ, as the Manithes and other heretikes do, but they beleue in the same true Christ that we do, confessing him to be equal and coeternal to his Father, beleuing him to be truly man, that he came from heauen, and that he is to returne againe at* the last day, *but because they, not knowing the iustice of God, would establish their owne iustice*: the holie Doctor concludeth, that for this one error wherin they were like to the foolish virgins, though in manie other things they were like to wise virgins, *if they slept in the*

merito foris erunt. *one, and so awaking that is rising from death, should be found without they should worthely remaine without, because in the meane time,* before they slept *they entred not in.* And the same would he say to anie Protestant Puri-

Symb. Athan. tane or the like, notwithstanding he beleueth in Christ, seing he doth not wholly and inuiolably beleue the Catholique Christian faith. Wherfore if you wil be in the state and posibilitie of saluation, returne to the Catholique Church the only house of saluation, because it is the only true Church: as I haue shewed in the second booke & in the Epistle to the honorable priuie counsel: where & in manie other places of this booke you may see how the markes of the true christian Church agree al vnto it, & to no other. Why then doubtest thou, why differrest thou to enter into so secure an hauen, and to repose thy selfe vpon this pillar of truth? *Shal we doubt saith* S. Augu-

li. de vtil. credēdi. c. 18. stin, *to repose our selues in that Churches lappe, which euen from the Apostles sitting & ruling therin by succession of Bishops (heretikes in vaine barking against it, &*

it, & partly by the common iudgement of the people, partly by the grauitie of councels, partly by the maieſtie of miracles being condemned) hath obtayned the top and height of authoritie? Three things held the ſame great Doctor in this Church, Succeſsion of Prieſts in S. Peters Seate, Conſent of nations, and the name Catholique: al which I haue shewed in the ſaid ſecond booke to remaine ſtil in the ſame Catholique Romain Church. And why then feareſt thou, where ſo lerned a Father found him ſelfe ſo ſecure? and where els canſt thou ſettle thy ſelfe ſecurly, but where only al ancient Chriſtians haue hoped for ſaluation? Certes if in this Church thou canſt not be ſaued, al thy foreſathers, though neuer ſo religious and vertuous, were damned, for there was neuer anie other commonly knowen & receued for the true Chriſtian Church. *lib. cont. ep. Fund.*

6. Thoſe Neroes, Domitians, Diocletians, Maximinians, againſt this Church, as the only true Church of Chriſt, which they therfore eſpecially hated, armed their furie, and whetted their inſtruments of crueltie. And as Iuſtinus Martyr noted, they neuer perſecuted the heretikes of their time, *becauſe* (ſaith he) *the diuel knowing his owne incenſed them only againſt the true Church, the only enemie of his Kingdom.* And if they were now liuing, and ſaw the ſtate of the preſent Romane Church, they would ſweare by their crownes and ſcepters, it is the ſame with that, againſt which they were ſo enraged. And if they ſaw this new Sinagogue of our deformed deformers, the would auouch by their honours, that they neuer ſtricke blow againſt it, neither could, becauſe it was not. Al the ancient and worthie Chriſtian Kinges of France, England, Spaine, Scotland, Pooland, Beamland, and ſuch others were baptiſed, ſacred, and crowned in our Religion, and by the handes of our ſo graue and holie Biſhops. And they promiſed by ſolemne oath to defend our Religion & Clergie, as I haue briefly ſhewed in myn Epiſtle to the honourable Counſel, yea this is ſo an approued & knowen a Tradition, that the new Superintendents of England were to ſeek and knew not where to begin, nor what Ceremonies to vſe in the coronation of our worthy King, bicauſe nether they nor any of their proper predeceſſours had been accuſtomed vnto ſuch an office: it hauing euer been the office of our bishops, as to conſecrate preeſtes with holy oyle, ſo to anoint and ſacre Kinges. And not only the Popes, Patriarches, and Primates, but all other Bishops alſo euen of our great Britannie, were conſecrated in, and by our Church and ruled in the ſame. Al the lerned Doctors & Fathers, *in prefat. defenſ. ad Anton. pium.* *annointing of Kings by a Bishop.*

go for best, deserue hel fire, & that no man can resist the diuel, in anie tentation, but must nedes yeld vnto him, and further more it leadeth to al heresies vices and atheisme, which are the very pathes, yea the gates and directest entrance into hel. So you see what a deformed and deforming congregation this new Synagogue is: and consequently how iust cause you that are in it, haue to hasten your selues out of it.

5. But I know what some wil say: that for sooth you see & confesse, this new Church hath manie grosse absurdities, yet because it beleueth in Christ, and the B. Trinitie, you hope in this Church and faith you may be saued. Which flatring conceipt, I haue refu-
4. *chap.* ted in the second booke. Where I haue shewed, that anie one heresie cutteth of from the true Church, & is cause of eternal damnation. Here only I remit you to S. Augustin: who speaking of the Pelagianes, pronounceth this sentence of them. *Neither* (saith he) *are these*
To. 2. ep. *Pelagian heretikes such as thou wouldest easily contemne, because they liue continently, and are laudable in good workes, neither do they beleue in a false Christ,*
120. cap. 37. *as the Manithes and other heretikes do, but they beleue in the same true Christ that we do, confessing him to be equal and coeternal to his Father, beleuing him to be truly man, that he came from heauen, and that he is to returne againe at* the last day, *but because they, not knowing the iustice of God, would establish their owne iustice:* the holie Doctor concludeth, that for this one error wherin they were like to the foolish virgins, though in manie other things they were like to wise virgins, *if they slept in that*
merito foris erunt. *one, and so awaking that is rising from death, should be found without they should worthely remaine without, because in the meane time,* before they slept *they entred not in.* And the same would he say to anie Protestant Puri-
Symb. Athan. tane or the like, notwithstanding he beleueth in Christ, seing he doth not wholly and inuiolably beleue the Catholique Christian faith. Wherfore if you wil be in the state and possibilitie of saluation, returne to the Catholique Church the only house of saluation, because it is the only true Church: as I haue shewed in the second booke & in the Epistle to the honorable priuie counsel: where & in manie other places of this booke you may see how the markes of the true christian Church agree al vnto it, & to no other. Why then doubtest thou, why differrest thou to enter into so secure an hauen, and to repose thy selfe vpon this pillar of truth? *Shal we doubt saith* S. Augu-
li. de vtil. credēdi. c. 18. stin, *to repose our selues in that Churches lappe, which euen from the Apostles sitting & ruling therin by succession of Bishops (heretikes in vaine barking against it, &*

it, & partly by the common iudgement of the people, partly by the grauitie of councels, partly by the maiestie of miracles being condemned) hath obtayned the top and height of authoritie? Three things held the same great Doctor in this Church, Succession of Priests in S. Peters Seate, Consent of nations, and the name Catholique: al which I haue shewed in the said second booke to remaine stil in the same Catholique Romain Church. And why then feareſt thou, where so lerned a Father found him selfe so secure? and where els canst thou settle thy selfe securly, but where only al ancient Christians haue hoped for saluation? Certes if in this Church thou canst not be saued, al thy forefathers, though neuer so religious and vertuous, were damned, for there was neuer anie other commonly knowen & receued for the true Christian Church. *lib. cont. ep. Fund.*

6. Those Neroes, Domitians, Diocletians, Maximinians, against this Church, as the only true Church of Christ, which they therfore especially hated, armed their furie, and whetted their instruments of crueltie. And as Iustinus Martyr noted, they neuer persecuted the heretikes of their time, *because* (saith he) *the diuel knowing his owne incensed them only against the true Church, the only enemie of his Kingdom.* And if they were now liuing, and saw the state of the present Romane Church, they would sweare by their crownes and scepters, it is the same with that, against which they were so enraged. And if they saw this new Sinagogue of our deformed deformers, the would auouch by their honours, that they neuer stricke blow against it, neither could, because it was not. Al the ancient and worthie Christian Kinges of France, England, Spaine, Scotland, Pooland, Beamland, and such others were baptised, sacred, and crowned in our Religion, and by the handes of our so graue and holie Bishops. And they promised by solemne oath to defend our Religion & Clergie, as I haue briefly shewed in myn Epistle to the honourable Counsel, yea this is so an approued & knowen a Tradition, that the new Superintendents of England were to seek and knew not where to begin, nor what Ceremonies to vse in the coronation of our worthy King, bicause nether they nor any of their proper predecessours had been accustomed vnto such an office: it hauing euer been the office of our bishops, as to consecrate preestes with holy oyle, so to anoint and sacre Kinges. And not only the Popes, Patriarches, and Primates, but all other Bishops also euen of our great Britannie, were consecrated in, and by our Church and ruled in the same. Al the lerned Doctors & Fathers, *in prefat. defens. ad Anton. pium.* *annointing of Kings by a Bishop.*

S. Clement, Dyonisius Areopagita, Ignatius, Martialis the Apostles owne scholars, and others succeding, as S. Cyprian Ambrose, Augustin, Ierome, Gregorie, Leo, Ciril, Basil, Chrysostome, and manie moe taught and defended our Religion with tongue and penne. Al those General and venerable Concels of Nice, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople, and the rest were called by our Popes and consisted of our Bishops. The canonical Scriptures are ours, & haue euer bene in our possession, and had neuer come to Luthers handes had not our Church conserued them. Al Diuine Seruice, as Masse Canonical houres & the rest be ours. Al Ecclesiastical gouuerment & discipline is ours. As for new Iniunctions & lately made Canons they are only imitations of ours. The Canon Law is nothing els but Decrees, and Decretal Epistles of Popes, & Bishops, especially assembled in Councels. The ciuil & cómon Lawes are ful of constitutions made for the mantenance of our Church, and expresly against heretikes her deadlie enemies. The schoole diuines, who for lerning haue the next place after the Fathers, explicate and defend our Religion against Turkes, & al Infidels, as Petrus Lombardus, Albertus, Hales, Aquinas, Scotus, Bonauenrura & such like. Al the Abbots, Mounkes Eremites, Friars, and other Religious men were Papistes in the highest degree by our aduersaries confession; yet were they Paules, Antonies, Macarius, Basiles, Gregories, Ieromes, Augustins, Benedicts, Bernards, Dominikes, Franceses, & such like. Yea al the order, or Hiererchie of the Eccleſiastical stare is onlie ours, for that which now they haue in England, is but an imitation, or rather a corruption of the same. Yea al ciuil and temporal dignitie in the Church, of Kings Dukes, Earles, Barons, knights is ours, & procedeth from our Church touching the ceremonies vsed in their creation. For example M. Camden testifyeth that in ancient time, when a knigth was to be dubbed, he was to watch the night before in prayer, and after confession to heare Masse, & communicate in the same: then the swoord was blessed and deliuered vnto him. Thus knights were made in the time of the Saxons. Al conuersions of countries to Christian Religion were made by our Church, & to our Religion, as Bosius in his histories of euerie countrie hath clerly shewed. For example, our King Lucius receiued Christian faith from Pope Eleutherius, as M. Camden and al our late chroniclers confesse. And againe, Pope Gregorie the first, restored our Religion, which by the Saxons entrie was extinguished in most partes of England; & that he did by Monkes. And

The nerma of making knights in Eng land in old time.

li. 4. de signis Eccl.

now

now in this laſt age by diuers Orders of Religious men, eſpecially by Ieſuites, the new found landes are cõuerted to the ſame Religion. And neuer yet could Heretikes conuert anie countrie from Paganiſme to Chriſtianitie. But after their conuerſion haue peruerted ſome, that is, after the good corne was ſowed, they haue ſcatered their cockle. Al the Saintes in heauen had their ſanctitie from Chriſt in our Church. And if they ſhould now ſpeake with an audible voice, you ſhould heare thẽ al auouch, that they were Apoſtles, Martyrs, Doctors, Virgins, and Confeſſors of our Church militant in earth, and were from hence trãſported to the Church triumphant in heauen. And therfore by our Chucrh only their liues, actes, and paſſions are recorded, their memories and feaſtes celebrated, by vs they are honoured, by the pretended reformers much debaſed, & by ſome reuiled. Laſtly becauſe I would not be tedious, al Churches, Abbeys, Nunries, Vniuerſities, moſt Colleges, & Hoſpitals were founded by our Catholique Kings, Biſhops, & others of our Religion. And namely our vniuerſities of Oxford and Cambridge by M. Cãdens owne confeſſion, are to thank the Church of Rome, for making them of Colleges Vniuerſities. So that al good & ſpecial things in the Chriſtian world, came from our Church, or be only to be fond of ancient time in our Churches, & al waſte, ruine, & deformitie from the new Synagogue, as I haue proued: and al ancient monuments, euen to tombes, walles, and windowes ſhew only our Chnrch, and Religion: and demonſtrate that the Church, commonly coũted Chriſtian, was euer permanent, viſible, & conſpicuous & neuer died, nor ſo decayed, that it became inuiſible, neuer lurked, nor lay hid in corners. And where then was this preſent Church of England? what Church alwayes florished but ours?

Heretikes diminish Chriſtianitie, but increaſe it not.

Our Vniuerſities ordayned by the Pope.

7. They anſwer that our Church was once the true Church, but after wards (they ſay) it degenerated. But when, how, by whom, and by what occaſion it was thus metamorphized, they know not. But I haue proued, in the ſecond booke, and in myn Epiſtle, to the Coũſel that the true Church can not degenerate in matters of faith & Religion. And conſequently if our Church once was the true Church, ſtil it is. And if once it was pure, and free from errors, ſtil it is, & the deformers departing from this Church are herettikes, & their opiniõs, which they hold againſt her, are hereſies. And ſeing that one hereſie cutteth from the Chnrch (as in the aforſaid places is proued) they are out of the true Church, and ſo long as they ſo remaine, they are out of al poſſibilitie of ſaluation.

the true Church faileth not. ca. 5.

8. Why

8. Why then lingreſt thou to leaue this ſo deformed and deforming a companie? Why doubteſt thou to incorporate thy ſelfe to that Church, for which al ancient monumẽts do make ſo manifeſtly: & in which al ancient Chriſtianes haue repoſed them ſelues ſo ſecurely? More ſecure certes it is (though there were no certaintie of the church) to aduenture ſaluation with them, then with the Proteſtãtes of this ſo new and ſo improbable a Religion. But manie other arguments for this Church I haue vſed in this booke, then I nede here repete, & thoſe ſo pregnant & conuincing, that vnles thou be negligent in pondering, or wilful in reſiſting the clere truth, thou canſt not but acknowledge the Romaine Church to be the only true Chriſtian Church, it being ſo viſible, that as S. Auguſtin ſaith, *they are ſtark blind, which ſee not this citie ſituated on a mountaine, this tabernacle placed in the ſunne, and this light ſet vpon a candleſtike, not couered vnder a bushel.* And acknowledging this Church I hope thou wilt not differ thy incorporation. For although thou maiſt be damned in this Church, if thou liueſt not accordingly, becauſe the bodie hath dead members, and the tree hath rotten bowes, yet if thou be ſeuered from this bodie by hereſie or ſchiſme, thou canſt not poſſibly be ſaued, becauſe thou canſt not be partaker of the grace, the ſoule, and life of this bodie, except thou be an inherent member ther of.

Tract. 2. in Ep. 10.
Mat. 5.
Pſal. 18.

9, For, as the ſame S. Auguſtin ſaith, the Church being a myſtical bodie not vnlike to the natural bodie of man, as the ſoule is the life of mans bodie, ſo the ſpirit of God is the ſoule that animateth, & geueth life to the myſtical bodie of Chriſts Church. And as the ſoule though it impert liſe equally to al partes, yet imperteth not al offices vnto them, for the eye only ſeeth, and the eare only heareth; ſo the ſpirite of God communicateth not the ſame functions to al members of the Church, but to ſome it imperteth virginitie, & religious life, to ſome wedlock chaſtitie, & ſome are Doctors, ſome Paſtores, ſome Euangeliſtes, ſome worke miracles, ſome haue the gift of prophecie. But as the members cut of, do preſently loſe liſe and feeling, becauſe the ſoule foloweth not the partes cut of, but remaineth with the whole, and with the partes vnited: ſo (ſaith this great Doctor) if by hereſie or ſchiſme thou be ſeuered from the bodie of the Church, there is no more life remayning in thee: *If therfore* (ſaith this Father) *thou wilt liue of Gods holie Spirite, hold charitie, loue veritie, ſeeke vnitie, that thou maiſt come to eternitie.* The ſame Doctor with S. Cyprian auoucheth that heretikes are beames ſeperated from the ſunne, riuers cut of from

Ser. 186. de tempore.
Ro. 12.
1. Cor. 12.
Ibidem.

the fountayne, and boughes riuen of from the tree. And consequently their light goeth out, their water drieth vp, and they are quite deuoide of sappe and life. Wherfore saith he out of the Church thou maist haue honour, & dignitie, thou maist haue the Sacraments also, thou maist sing *Alleluia*, and answer, *Amen*. Thou maist haue the Gospel, thou maist preach Christ, and beleue in the name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holie Ghost. Finally thou maist haue al but saluation out of the Catholique Church. but a poore al it is, Which comprehendeth not saluation. Which is al in al.

Tomo 10. ser. 181 & to. 7. li. cont. Crisc. ca. 33. Cypri. de simplicit. Prelat.

10. Come then (gentle reader) come al ye that are cut of from this bodie, vnite your selues vnto it, if you wil be partakers of life. *Venite fratres* (saith the same Doctor) *si vultis vt inseramini in vite. dolor est cum vos videmus precisos ita iacere, numerate Sacerdotes vel ab ipsa petri sede, & in ordine illo Patrum, quis cui successit videte, Ipsa est petra, quam non vincunt superba inferorum portæ.* Come bretheren that ye may be ingraffed in the vine. It is a grief when we see you lie cut of in this maner: number the Priestes euen from Peters seate, and see who succeded to whom in that order of Fathers: that is the rock, Which the prow de gates of hel do not ouercome. And againe in an other place: *Firmiter tene, & uullatenus dubita, quemlibet hereticum vel schismaticum, in nomine Patris & Filij & Spiritus sancti baptizatum, si Ecclesiæ Catholicæ non fuerit aggregatus, quantascumque eleemosinas fecerit, & si pro Christi nomine sanguinem fuderit, nullatenus posse saluari.* Hold firmely, and doubt not at al, that no heretike nor schismatike (a sore saying for those in England, who being Catholiques in hart, but by communicating externally with heretikes, make them selues externally members of their Church, and so cut them selues of from ours) although baptized in the name of the Father and the Sonne and the Holie Ghost, can be saued, how great almes soeuer he geueth, yea although he shede his bloud for Christs name.

To. 7. Psal. contra partem Donati.

Tomo. 3. de fide ad Petrum. c. 3. 8. 39.

The state of an heretike, or schismatike.

11. Wherfore once againe, gentle reader, I desire thee, as thou tendereſt thy saluation (and marke what I say, when I say saluation) vnite thy self vnto this bodie of the Catholique Church, from vvhich euerie heresie cutteth of, and out of which thou canst not worke thy saluation. And therfore neither to gaine a world (which if thou hadest thou couldest not long possesse) neither for feare of losse of landes, liuings, or life, seperate thy self from this Church. For what wil it pleasure thee to gaine a world, with losse of thy soule, which is worth tenne thousand worldes? And what shouldest thou

Saluation importeth more then manie vvorldes.

feare so much, as to be seuered from that Church, which separation importeth a losse no lesse then of soule and bodie, the damnation of soule and bodie euerlasting? Wherfore yet once againe (because thy saluation can not be to often inculcated) feare nothing so much as to be seuered from this bodie, out of which who liueth is dead, & whosoeuer dieth is certaynly damned. And let this sentence of S. Augustin (with whom as I haue begunne, so wil I end) alwayes be printed in thy hart. *Tract. 27. in Ioan.* *Nihil sic formidare debet Christianus, quam seperari a corpore Christi, quod est Ecclesia, vtique Vna Catholica: si enim separatur a corpore Christi non est membrum eius, si non est membrum eius, non vegetatur spiritu eius: quisquis autem spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est eius.* Nothing ought a Christian to feare so much, as to be separated frō the bodie of Christ, which is the Church: One and Catholique: for if he be separated from the bodie of Christ, he is no member of his, if he be not his member he is not quickned with his spirite: and whosoeuer hath not the spirite of Christ, that man is not his. And I wil adde, that he that is not partaker of Christs grace and spirite in his Church militant in earth, shal haue no part with him in the glorie of his Church triumphant in heauen. And therfore I besech our Lord Iesus Christ, in whose name dwelleth grace, geue thee so much grace, as may make thee desirous, and careful of thy saluarion, and this Sune of iustice send thee some beames of his light, to illuminate thyne eyes, to see the right way, that leadeth to saluation. And becausse this way is true Religion, and true Religio bringeth to eternal life: I besech this *dore* to open thyne hart and direct thee into this way: I besech this *vvay* guide thee in the truth, I besech this *truth* leade thee to the life of thy soule, I besech this *life* to protect thee and bring thee to life euerlasting. Amen. *Rom. 8.*

FINIS.

A TABLE

A TABLE OF THE *principal things proued or disproued in this booke.*

A

Aaron was sent, els he would not, nor ought not to haue preached to others. pag. 2.

Abraham offered tithes to Melchisedech, and was blessed of him. 71

Abrogation of old Sacrifices doth not preiudicate an other Sacrifice in the new law, but rather proueth it. 208.

Absurdities of the new doctrin 395. in the Epistles to the King, to the Coũsel, to the Reader. and in euerie part of this *Survey*.

Adam a perfect man the first day. 167. Indued with great science & knowledge. 168.

Adam sinning we al sinned in him, and so are borne in sinne. 225.

Adoration called Latria dew to God only: called Dulia or hyperdulia, to Saincts & holy thinges. 191.

Aduents of of Christ one in humilitie, the other in maiestie. 161. the new doctrin taketh away the second. 363.

Almes and fasting are the wings of prayer. 233

Adultrie should be lawful by the new doctrin. 332.

Angel signifiing *messenger*, and Apostle signifying *sent*, are examples that al preachers must be sent. 2. 3.

Angels proue a God. 342.

Annointing, *See Extreme Vnction.*

Annointing of Kings with holie oyle. 399.

Antichristian doctrin of Luther Caluī & other Protestants 136. and in al the third booke.

Antiquitie a good proofe of Religion. 60.

Apostacie differeth from heresie. 102.

Apostles al Priests. 200. They seemed vnlikelie men to gaine the world from Idolatrie to Christianitie. 56. The effect whereof proueth Christian Religion to be of God. 58.

Atheisme properly is to denie that there is a God. To confesse God in word, but to esteeme more of policie as Machiuelians do, is an other kinde. Both are monstrous 337.

Atheisme the end of heresie. 86.

Atheists in extremitie cõmonly confesse a God. 348.

B

Baptisme a Sacramẽt of spiritual generation. 213. 217. not necessarie by the new doctrin. 224. proued necessarie, and their arguments answered. 225.

Bare letter, *See Scripture.*

Bishops must be annointed with holie oyle & cõsecrated canonically. 399.

Bishop of Rome is S. Peters Successor. 75.

Blasphemies most common in the Gospelers. 37. 187. & in al the third, and fifth bookes especially

Breaking from the known Church a marke of Heretikes. 89.

C

Caluin preferreth his owne vnderstãding of Scripture by the spirit, before al mens iudgment. 36. 46. His life & death most vvicked 63. He vvresteth holie Scripture which affirmeth Baptisme to be necessarie. 225. His blasphemous doctrin against Christ. 138. & seq. He playeth the Iew. 140. He holdeth that Christ was ignorãt. 169 His argumẽts for the same. 170. He preferreth Christ to hel. 180. He maketh God the author of sinne. 241. yea the only sinner. 245.

Caluin died in desperation. 182. His absurdities and blasphemies in most pages *of this Survey.*

Catholique signifieth vniuersal in time, place, and person. 130.

Catholique name a marke of the onlie true Church. 129.

Catholique Religion proued the only true Religion. 352.

Cerdons heresie of two goddes is not more absurde, then that God commandeth impossible thinges, & damneth men for not doing the same. 250

Charitie maketh vs not only the seruãts of God, but also his freinds. 184. Chastitie a special vertue and precious iewel 322. esteemed and observed by the light of nature amongst Painimes, yea among brute beastes ibidem. most beseemeth mans nature, the contrarie most disagreing. 323. Chastitie of virgins, vvidowes, and maried persons al cõmendable. 327. The new doctrin is enemie to al three sortes. 328.

Chastitie iudged impossible by these fleslie prophets. 331.

Christs Incarnation. 367.

Christ sheweth that he was sent by his Father, els none had bene bound to belue him. 2. He proueth his mission by miracles. 12. Christ Why is called heauenlie. 17.

Christ principal head of the Church hath a vicarial head in earth. 72.

Christ a Priest a Sacrifice, & God. 139.

Christ cõfessed by Heretikes in wordes only, but despised in their dedes, and depraued by their doctrin. 135.

Christ an absurd Redemer by the new doctrin. 143. not complete 180. no Redemer at al. 147.

Not a spiritual Phisition by the same doctrin. 150. Not a Lawgeuer. 153, 154 Not a Iudge. 161.

Christ is proued to be in dede a Redemer most complet, a Phisition, a Lawgeuer & a Iudge, in the same places.

Christ could not feare the iudgment of his Father as Caluinistes blaspheme. 173. His Transfiguratiõ was not miraculous, but rather it was a miracle that his bodie was not alwayes glorious. 174. He feared death, but not hel nor damnation. 175. His feare of death was of charitie, not of impotencie. 176. He could not despaire. 176. He could not suffer hel paines as Caluin blasphemeth. 179.

Christ really present in the B. Sacrament, *see Eucharist.*

Church a visible Societie of the faithful, and neuer inuisible. 117. A more goodlie palace then the vvorld. 394.

It neuer faileth. 8. 108. 111. Neuer erreth, nor is corrupted in doctrin. 53. 92. 113. 401. the contrarie doctrin openeth the way to Atheisme. 354.
Church euer had a visible head. 70. Her head since Christs Ascention, S. Peter and his successors, the Bishops of Rome. 75.
Church comonly called Catholique is the only place of saluatiō. 398. 402
Comming to preach vvithout sending a marke of false Prophets. 3. 117. 131.
Commandements of God, by Protestants doctrin impossible to be kept. 246. But by holie scripture both possible and easie. 247. To say they are impossible openeth the way to al vvickednes. 302. 315.
Cōmandments or lawes differ from Counsels 267.
Confidence amongst neighbours and felowes abandoned by the new doctrin. 270.
Confirmation is a spiritual augmentation of those that are borne spiritually by Baptisme. 214. Proued to be a a Sacrament. 218.
Conscience a singular bridle against vice. 309. It is a law that bindeth, a witnes that accuseth: 310. a Iudge that cōdemneth or absolueth: an executioner that tormenteth or quieteth: and a magistrate that ruleth the inward man. 311. 312. 313.
Conscience euen of the most vvicked sinners at last confesseth a God. 349.
Conscience abandoned by the new doctrin, & therby a monstrous gappe is made to al wickednes. 394.
Constantin punished condemned Heretikes. 133.
Councels are of great authoritie. 43.
Councels lawfully called and confirmed decide controuersies in Religion 132. and condemne heretikes ibidem. How Councels differ in authoritie from Scriptures. 23.
Crosse of Christ and signe therof. 186.

D.

Desperation imputed to our Sauiour by Caluin. 176.
Dissension in matter of faith a marke of Heretikes. 118. 123. Protestants cōfesse and lament their owne dissentions. 125 It ruineth al things 120. It bringeth al Religion in contempt, & so maketh way to Atheisme. 363.
The diuel apishly hath his ministers of Idolatrie, and heresie, as God hath of Religion 16. He also alleageth Scripture 20 He bewrayeth him selfe by one signe or other. 89.
Diuorsment permitted in manie strāge cases by Protestants. 329.

E.

Emperour can not be supreme Iudge in Religion. 81.
England hath lost much by leauing the Romain Church. 37. 82.
Eucharist is spiritual nutriment: the greatest Sacramēt 214. Real presence of christ confessed by Luther in this Sacrament. 227. Denied by other Sectaries. 228. proued by the signes, prophecies, and promise of it. 229 368. Though by faith we know Christs real presence, yet faith can not make him present, as Caluin would haue it. 230.

it. 230. Caluins bread not ſo good as a ſigne. 377. a great body may be in a ſmal rowme. 373. one body in many places at once. 374.
Euchariſt contayneth Chriſt really, & ſubſtantially, els no truth in chriſtian doctrin. 391. Denial therof bringeth in Atheiſme. 392.
Excellencie ciuil, ſupernatural, and diuine. 190. Ciuil honour is dew to the firſt: religious honour called dulia or hyperdulia is dew to the ſecond: and diuine honour to the third. 190.
Extreme Vnction proued a Sacrament. 215. 220.

F.

Faith aboue reaſon but not contrarie to reaſon. 54. 55.
Faith a theological vertue. 59.
Faith admitteth no noueltie 55. and why? 57
Faith ſtrangely planted; yea moſt miraculouſly. 58.
Faith only doth not iuſtifie. 280. The ſolifidian doctrin openeth the way to al vice. 283.
Faith which the new doctrin deſcribeth & requireth, is a priuate perſwaſion of euerie one, that him ſelfe ſhal be ſaued, 286. This doctrin brideth pride. 316 It is directly againſt Scripture. 288. It is a lying faith. 335. If this faith or perſwaſion could iuſtifie or ſaue, no ſinne but infidelitie could damne anie man. 290.
It is vnpoſſible for a ſinner to haue this faith. & cõſequently vnpoſſible to be ſaued. 333. Onlie faith without good workes maketh chriſtian perfection to conſiſt in idlenes. 321.
Faſting and almes the two wings of prayer. 233.
Fathers of the Church are of great authoritie. 48. 52. 67.
Fathers aboue al compariſon better then the new preachers. 49. 62. Their authoritie troubled Luther. 50.
Fathers ſeuerally may erre, but not al agree in anie error. 53.
By reiecting the Fathers, way is made to al hereſies. 52.
Feare and hope both neceſſarie. 171.
Feare is of diuers ſortes, reuerential, filial, ſeruile, & humain. 275.
Reuerential, and filial are neceſſarie in al. 275. Seruile feare no ſinne, but a good bridle againſt ſinne. 274.
Feare of hel profitable to manie. 278. Yea neceſſarie to ſome 279.
Humaine feare is ſometimes good, ſometimes badde. 275.
Feare of hel taken away by the new reformers 277. Yea other better feares alſo. 276.
Feare of hel differeth from feare of other punishments, & bridleth more mens conſciences. 278.
Feare of death is no ſinne. 177.
Feare of death in Chriſt, 175.
It made him ſweat bloud. 176.
Felicitie conſiſteth in action not in idlenes: & ſo workes not idle faith, are the meanes to felicitie. 319.
Freindship of ſingular force. 183.
Friewil in man is a moſt certaine truth. 295. yet denied by ſenſles heretikes of this time. 296.
Friewil proued by reaſon. 298. by holy Scrip-

Scripture. 299. If there were not frie wil, there were neither vertue nor vice. 308. Denial therof openeth the way to al vice & wickednes. 301 314. alſo to Atheiſme. 350.

G.

God can not be deſcribed, nor knowē what he is in this life. 338. Yet that God is, & that he is one in ſubſtance, is euident by reaſon. 339.
God proued by manie arguments againſt Atheiſtes. 340. 341. &c.
God is independent, and al creatures depend on him. 347.
God imperteth him ſelfe bountifully to creatures. 128. More liberal to mā ſince Chriſts Incarnation. 129.
God ought to be ſerued with ſoule & bodie. 205.
God by the opinion of ſome old heretikes is indirectly called the author of ſinne. 240. but by Caluin and his diſciples directly. 241. This doctrin openeth the gappe to al vvickednes. 304. 315. Alſo to Atheiſme. 349.
God not to be the author, nor anie cauſe at al of ſinne, is demonſtrated by Catholiques. 242. with confutation of Caluīs euaſion. 243. God shold be the only ſinner, and diuels & men no ſinners at al, if Caluiniſt doctrin were true. 245.
God were vnreaſonable if he cōmanded things impoſſible. 248. yea cruel & tyrannical for damning men if the new doctrin were true. 251.
God is in dede moſt iuſt, and moſt merciful. 249. To ſay (as proteſtants do) that God imputeth not ſinne to the faithful, is either to make him an vniuſt eſtemer of mens actions, or to make ſinne no ſinne, both which implicate contradiction. 308. This doctrin alſo openeth the way to al wickednes. 314.

H.

Head or ſuperior neceſſarie in euerie ſocietie. 68. Moſt eſpecially in the Church. 69. yea a viſible head. 77. No one head amongſt heretikes, but manie, 77. 79. Want of one viſible head bringeth in Atheiſme. 364.
Heauen ſet forth in holie Scripture by al glorious titles, to allure men to laboure for it. 273. 277.
Heauen and celeſtial orbes proue a God. 342.
Hel ſet forth in holie Scriptures terrible, to terrifie ſinners. 274.
Hel extenuated and counted leſſe terrible by heretikes. 397.
Hel paines are not ſatisfactorie. 182.
Hereſie though in one only point is damnable. 102. 398.
Heretikes alleage Scriptures for their opinions. 17 And why? 19.
Heretikes are ſick of ſelfe loue. 34. They arrogate al to their owne priuate ſpirite. 36.
Heretikes to be pitied, but Arch-heretikes to be punished. 44. They are worſe then Iewes, or Paganes. 45. Heretikes contemne Councels & al Fathers. 46. & therby bewray them ſelues. 48. & cut them ſelues of from the Church. 49.
Heretikes haue no ſtay nor end in deuiſing new doctrines. 83.

Here-

Heretikes can not long remaine without bewraying them selues, by one make or other. 90.
Heretikes, at least Arch-heretikes were first members of the Catholique Church. 91.
Heretikes are knowne by particular names. 98. They are like vipers. 125. Like cadmees & Sãpsons foxes. 126.
Heretikes old and new flatter Princes for aduantage 257. but contemne the authoritie of Princes vvhen they are strong without them. 258
Heretikes are traytors to Christ. 195
Heretikes are directly or indirectly Idolaters. 251.
Heretikes of these dayes are a most deformed congregation, 395. and do most deforme God, Christ, Church and al good things. 396. 397.
Hope and feare the stayes of common wealths. 272. Hope of worldlie things of great force, much more of heauenlie things. 274.
Hope of heauen necessarie. 278.
Hope of heauen taken away by the new preachers. 278.

I.

Idlenes forbid by God & nature. 317.
Idlenes naturally auoided by al creatures. 318.
Idlenes pernicious and hurtful. 320.
Idlenes is christian perfection by the sequele of Protestants doctrin. 321.
Iewes Religion better then the Samaritanes. 66.
Iewes Religion better (that is lesse wicked) then heresie. 45.
Ignorance not admitted in Christ, 168. And why? 171.
Ignorance blasphemously imputed to Christ by the new Gospellers. 169.
Images honored for their sakes whom they represent. 185.
Images of Christ, and his Saincts, contemned and reuiled by Protestants. 189. 192.
Images proued lawful and profitable by holie Scriptures. 195.
Imputatiue iustice and no inherent in the iustest man by Protestants doctrin. 143. By this doctrin they make them selues as iust as Christ. 166.
It nourisheth their pride. 316.
Iudge of controuersies in religion necessarie. 68. The Protestãts haue none. 77. They can not choose one. 81.
Iudgement consisteth in three offices al vvhich the Protestants take from Christ. 162.
Iudges, and Iudgement seates are brought in contempt by Protestants doctrin. 162.
Iudges being contemned, the bridle is laxed to al malefactors. 264.

K.

Kinges are ordayned by God. 256.
Kinges of England annointed with holie Oyle by a Bishop. 399.
Kinges may make ciuil lawes vvhich bind the subiectes in conscience. 265.
Kinges and their lawes are contemned by the Gospellers. 258.
Knights made in England with solemne Ceremonies. 400.
Knowledge of Christ excelled Adams and Salomons knowledge, 168.

Knowledge of Christ excelled Adams and Salomons knowlege. 168
Knowlege of Christ was infused and did penetrate al Mysteries, and secrects, euen the cogitations of hartes. 165.

L.

Our B. Ladie beloued and respected by holie Angels, and al good men for Christs sake. 184. lightly estemed by some Protestants, contemned by some. 187. 188.
Law is the life of a ciuil bodie. 264.
Lawes of nature, of Moyses, and of Christ, al had Priests, and Sacrifice. 199.
Law of Christ excelleth al other lawes. 151. 153.
Lawes of Princes do bind in conscience. 156. They bind not by Protestants doctrin 159. 266. and breach of lawes no sinne. 387. and so by this doctrin are brought into contept 267. yea the dore is opened to al wickednes. 303
By saing that Christ hath fredvs from the law, they make him a fauorer of sinne. 304. and open the way to al vice. 314
Loue & freindship of great force. 185.
Loue of Christ great in al Saintes, especially in Martyrs. 184.
Luther an other Lucifer for his pride. 110.
Luthers life and death nothing like to an Apostle, but iump for an Apostata. 63.
Luthers fooliſh and false prophecie. 83. His attempt to vvorke a miracle, had il succesſe. 84. He preferreth him selfe before al Fathers, and Angels. 85. 362. He was sometimes troubled in conscience with the authoritie of Fathers against him. 50. He is conuinced with his owne argument. 51. He saith the diuels chappel is greater then Christs Church. 113. His doctrin against Christ. 137. He saith infants haue actual faith vvhen they are baptized. 222.
Luther curseth his scholars for leauing his doctrin. 124.

M.

Man a sociable creature. 254.
Markes of Heretikes agree to Protestants: 89. & in al the second booke.
Martyrs loue Christ feruently, and for his sake al persons and things that pertayne to him. 184.
Masse a Sacrifice. 160 208.
Masse is that Sacrifice which Malachie the prophete foretelleth. 210.
Where is no Masse, there no Sacrifice where no sacrifice no religio. 211.
Matrimonie a Sacrament. 215. 219.
Matrimonie sometimes commanded, vpon special cause. 323. but not simply preferred before virginitie. 324.
Melchisedech and Sem al one. 70. He was a Priest, yea high Priest. 71.
Melchisedech did offer Sacrifice. 160.
Ministers of the new doctrin nothing like the Fathers. 49 62.
Ministerie though collected in congration not able to iudge in religion. 79.
Mission ordinarie & extraordinarie 4.
Mission ordinarie is proued by succession

cessors extraordinarie by miracles. 5.
Moyses being sent extraordinarily proued his mission by miracles. 11.

N.

Names goe in discourse among men for things. 98.
Name Christian first distinguished the beleuers in Christ from Iewes and Painimes. 98.
Name Catholique distinguisheth true christiáns from coũterfeite. 129. 130.
Names taken of a particular Maister, (as Arius, Luther. Caluin) or vpon some accident (as Protestants. Hugonot) are markes of Heretikes. 99
New preachers are neither sent ordinarily, 6. nor extraordinarily 13. but borne monstrously. 10
New religion of these dayes hathe no probabilitie. 165.
Noueltie in doctrin a marke of Heretikes. 94

O.

Obedience better then sacrifice. 366.
Obedience to Princes, and to Superiors necessarie. 258.
Opinions in schoolpointes which are not matter of faith, make not Sectes. 101. 127.
Opinions contrarie to the Catholique faith make Sectes, & Heresies. 125.
Order, or Subordination of head and members is necessarie in euerie Societie. 68. And especially in the Church. 42. 69. 200.
Order a Sacrament. 215. 219.
Order of Priesthood, & other orders subordinate thereto, are proued. 201.
Where is no order of Priesthood, there is no Religion. 202.
Original sinne in vs all, at our birth. 11.

P.

Parliament no fit nor right Iudge in matters of Religion. 78.
Papist a name forced on Catholiques, not taken by them selues. 101.
Particides committed by Heretikes against the church once their mother. 45.
Pastors and preachers must be called and sent, els they are not lawful. 1.
Peace desired of al things. 118.
Peace and agreement in matters of faith a note of the true Church. 120.
S. Peter the rock of the Church vnder Christ. 74.
Penance spiritual phisicke. 114.
Penance a Sacrament. 118.
Prayer a great benefite, ordayned by God. 235.
Prayer obtayneth manie good things and satisfieth for misdedes. 235.
Prayer frequent amongst Catholiques: little vsed by Protestants. 234.
Prayer to Saincts honorable, and no way dishonorable to Christ. 193.
Proued by holie Scripture. 194.
Prayer by the new doctrin should not be vsed at all. 235. no nor our Lords Prayer. 237.
Pride the first sinne both in the diuel and man. 315.
Pride nourished and increased by the new doctrin. 316.
Priests necessarie in euerie law. 156.
Priests in the law of nature were the first borne; in Moyses law of the stock of Aaron; in the law of Christ

are chosen & cõsecrated. 71. 199. 203.
Not al men Priests. 202.
Priests and Sacrifice go alwayes together. 199.
Priests and Religion euer goe together. 199.
No Priests in dede amongst Protestats 203 & cõsequently no Religion. 204
Prince, or other layman is not, nor not be head of the Church. 77.
Princes chosen, or accepted of by the multitude are lawful. 255.
Their authoritie is of God. 256.
Princes may not trust their subiects by the new doctrin. 270.
No Prince at al by the new doctrin. 260.
Priuate spirite the onlie, and supreme iudge amongst Protestants. 36 proued to be no conuenient Iudge. 40.
Priuate spirite is an heretikes God. 36.
Priuate spirit maketh men insolent and proude. 317.
Protestats great flatterers of Princes for aduantage, 258. They contemne and rebel, when they are strong ynough. 259.
Puritanes and other Sectes are as wel assured of their Religion as Protestants of theirs. 82. 116.

R.

Real presence of Christ in the B. Sament. *see Eucharist.*
Reason is against the new religion and for the old Religion. 650.
Rebellion licented by the new doctrin. 268.
Religion the principal moral vertue. 350. How it differeth from superstition. 351.
Religion so strangely planted (as the catholique is) must nedes be of God. 583.
Religion not to be receiued without probabilitie. 60. Want of Religion is Atheisme. 333.
Reliques honoured for their sakes to whom they pertaine. 187. 192.
Reliques of Saintes contemned by heretikes. 199.
Reliques proued by holie Scripture to haue bene honoured. 195.
Romain Bishop S. Peters Successor. 75.
Romain Church most stable. 186.
Founded by the Apostles. 108.

S.

Sacraments necessarie to declare our dutie towards God necessarie also in respect of our selues. 212.
Sacraments of Christ seuen. 213. What things are required to a Sacrament. 217. Denied by Protestants to geue grace. 221. Proued. 221. Some Protestants allowe three Sacraments, some foure, some al seuen, the English but two. 20. Swenkfeldius denied al Scriptures & al Sacraments. 39.
Sacrifice obserued in al nations. 20.
Sacrifice necessarie in al Lawes and Religions. 206.
Sacrifice is the principal seruice of God. 269.
Sacrifice necessarie in the Church of Christ bicause it is the Image of the visible Sacrifice. 207. 208.
Sacrifice on the crosse bloudie, in the last supper vnbloudie 158. No Sacrifice no

fice no religiō, but Atheisme. 211 351.
Sacrifice on the crosse made not Christ an eternal Priest, but the vnbloudie according to the order of Melchisedech. 159.
Saluation only to be hoped for in the true Church. 102. 103. 401. 402.
Saincts honoured for Christs sake. 185. reuiled by Heretikes. 189.
Saincts do heare our prayers. 193.
Saincts pray for vs, and are to be prayed vnto. 194.
Scripture as the bare letter is no certaine rule. 24.
Scripture wrested to wrong sense is not Gods word. 21. yet considered in it selfe euerie word of Scripture is Gods word. 23. and hath a true sense though not vnderstood of al. 22. 24. 25
Scriptures hard to vnderstand, and three causes therof. 26.
Why heretikes hold Scriptures to be easie to vnderstand. 27.
Scriptures not made nor authorised by the Church, but knowen to vs by the church. 355. Denial therof bringeth Atheisme. 360. By denying some bookes, though they admite others, they take away the authoritie & certaintie of Scripture, & leade their followers to Atheisme. 362.
Sects are knowne by particular names 99. And by holding contrarie opinions in Articles of faith. 123.
Selfe loue an heretical sicknes. 13.
Sermons with a Geneua Psalme the onlie seruice among Puritanes. 234.
Sermons also superfluous by the new doctrin. 139.
Sinne were no sinne in a beleuer by the new doctrin. 307.
Sinne is not excused by a good end or meaning, when the act is bad. 244.
Sinners can neuer rise from sinne by the new doctrin. 314.
Societie or common wealth hath authoritie to defend it selfe. 255.
Which it doth by choosing & obeying one head. 256.
Societie euer requireth a head: 63.
Spirite of the Church is onlie visible. 42. See Priuate spirite.
Subiectes can not trust their Princes by this new doctrin. 270.
Subiectes nede not to obey Superiors by the new doctrin. 217. 266.
Succession of Pastors a note of the true Church 5. 109. The want of succession a mark of Heretikes. 5. 107. 117.
Supremacie necessarie in the militant Church. 74.

T.

Tertullian refused to dispute with heretikes by the bare letter of the Scriptures. 20.
Traditions of great authoritie, 6. not with Protestantes. 357.
Transfiguration of Christ no miracle, but rather a miracle, that his bodie was not alwayes glorious. 174.
Treason to a Prince to geue his peculiar honour to a subiect: so it is treason to God to geue diuine honour to creatures. 192.
Treason to God, and Prince, to geue their seruants no honour at al. 195.
Trinitie of Persons in God proued by Scriptures, expounded by Fathers; which

which otherwise would not convince an Heretike. 367.

V.

Vbiquitaries take away Christs Diuinitie. 138.
Veritie or apparance of veritie is the onlie obiect of vnderstanding. 333.
Vertue and vice in humain actions. 306. Neither vertue nor sinne in mens actiõs by the new doctrin. 308.
Virginitie preferred before Mariage, especially in the law of Christ. 324.
Vnitie in the catholique Church, not amongst Protestants. 82. 113.
The cause and stay of vnitie. 86. 87.
Vniuersities of Oxford & Cambridge ordayned by the Pope. 401.

W.

Wil of man free. 295. Denial therof maketh way to al vice. 300. yea to Atheisme. 350.
Workes good and bad. 306.
Workes of three sortes (as Plato also teacheth) vertuous, lesse vicious, enormious. 307.
Workes of the best men are mortal sinnes by the new doctrin. 192.
This doctrin ruineth mans nature: and al moral Philosophie. 293.
It is direct against holie Scripture. 294.
It leadeth to al vice. 308.
It maketh idlenes the perfectest part of christian life. 321.
Workes vvhich S. Paule excludeth from iustifying. 281.
World was created 340.
World not made by chance. 344.
This vvorld is a goodlie palace, yet not to rest in, but to passe through to eternal rest. 393.

FINIS.

THE PRINTER TO THE CVRTEOVS READER.

SOME faultes are here escaped in printing, though nothing nere so manie as in the former Edition. The greatest part seme to be in the marginal annotations: and perhaps some few in the quotations. I can not here set downe the errors, for that he who hath bestowed great diligence and paines, to auoide manie greater, hath not leysure to reade the whole once againe, for correcting of the smaller. But the iudicial reader wil easily vnderstand, how it should haue bene; and so of his curtesie amend and pardon that is amisse.

Deo gratias.

